SCOTTISH ATTITUDES TO IRELAND 1880-1914

ADAM C. I. NAYLOR

Ph.D.
University of Edinburgh
1985

CONTENTS PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I must thank Owen Dudley Edwards, the supervisor of this thesis who first suggested this topic to me and has overseen its writing with never-failing insight, encouragement and patience at its slow rate of production. He has taught me more than I can attempt to acknowledge here, not least that serious history can always be fun.

I wish to thank the staffs of the following institutions for their assistance and courtesy: the National Library of Scotland, the Special Collections room of the University of Edinburgh Library, Edinburgh Central Library, the Scottish Record Office, the British Library Manuscript Department and the House of Lords Record Office. I am grateful to the Earl of Balfour for permission to consult his family papers at Whittingehame and to the Scottish Liberal Party who allowed me to study their records in the University of Edinburgh Library.

Thesis-writing can be a lonely occupation and I have been sustained and helped by many friends, in particular 2 of my fellow-students Dr. Christopher McGimpsey of Belfast and Dr. Richard Rose of Iowa.

Finally it is a great pleasure to thank my wife Marianne who has put up with "Scottish Attitudes to Ireland" during 7 years when the exigencies of running a business have meant that it has occupied so many of my evenings and week-ends. Her lively and irreverent mind has come to my aid on numerous occasions.

Adam Naylor
Edinburgh, March 1985.

ABSTRACT

This thesis is an examination of Scottish attitudes to Ireland during the era of the Irish Home Rule agitation: from the rise of Parnell to the outbreak of the First World War.

After a general introduction dealing with links between the 2 countries prior to the period discussed and the emigration of many Irish to Scotland in the nineteenth century, the movement for the extension of Home Rule to Scotland is considered in some detail. This movement was a direct outgrowth of the Irish demand and yet differed from it in aims, methods and preconceptions. The uneasy relationship that thus developed between Irish and Scottish Home Rulers is analysed.

Later chapters consider other Scottish political and literary attitudes to and images of Ireland. An examination of the full range of Scottish political life is attempted, through consideration of the leading and representative figures that Scottish politics produced. These range from Keir Hardie on the left, through Rosebery and Haldane of the Liberals, to Balfour and Bonar Law, Unionist leaders with equally strong, though differently based, views on the Irish question.

Scottish literary authors with illuminating or sustained opinions on Ireland are also considered. These include Robert Louis Stevenson, William Sharp and the group who managed the Scots Observer. R. B. Cunninghame Graham and John Buchan are also discussed, imaginative authors who combined writing with active participation in politics.

Finally, in the conclusion, a portrayal of a generalised Scottish attitude to Ireland, common to all these varied responses and based on the Scottish image of the nature of the British state and its component parts, is attempted.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

SLP Mins.	Minute Books of the Scottish Liberal Party, University of Edinburgh Library.

Collections of papers of individuals:

BP	Arthur James Balfour, British Library.
BPW	Arthur James Balfour and Gerald Balfour, Whittingehame, East Lothian: available through the Scottish Record Office.
BLP	Andrew Bonar Law, House of Lords Record Office.
GP	Patrick Geddes, National Library of Scotland.
CGP	R. B. Cunninghame Graham, National Library of Scotland.
HP	Richard Burdon Haldane, National Library of Scotland.
KHP	J. Keir Hardie, National Library of Scotland.
RP	5th Earl of Rosebery, National Library of Scotland.
SP	William Sharp, National Library of Scotland.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

> The Irish nation is faced by a much more difficult Scottish problem than the Irish problem which vexes Scotland.
>
> Compton Mackenzie: Catholicism and Scotland

For 35 years before the First World War Ireland was one of the greatest preoccupations of British politics. In 1885-86, 1893 and 1911-14 it dominated the political scene during debates on Liberal proposals for Irish Home Rule. The first Home Rule Bill split the Liberal party, while the third animated the Conservatives to advocate armed resistance to the law. The level of acrimony the Irish question engendered was never paralleled elsewhere. The presence of a strong, voluble and determined Irish party in the House of Commons ensured that the problem remained constantly in public attention in one form or another.

Resistance to the union was endemic in nineteenth century Ireland. The first half of the century saw the rise of a great mass movement under Daniel O'Connell demanding first Catholic Emancipation and then repeal of the union. O'Connell's failure to deliver repeal, though on emancipation he had succeeded, led to the Young Ireland revolt of 1848. Though a dismal failure, the rising kept alive the tradition of armed revolt, going back to Wolfe Tone and the United Irishmen and beyond, a tradition taken up again by the Fenians in 1867. The period from the 1870s to 1914 was the period of constitutional nationalist agitation. The military alternative remained, of course, producing sporadic

bombing campaigns and emerging in full force in 1916 and 1919-20. The constitutional leaders were aware that the physical force men had little enthusiasm for their methods and limited patience. The first parliamentary party emerged in the 1850s and was known as "The Pope's Brass Band" during its brief and not very glorious history. A distinctively Irish party returned to parliament in the 1870s, allied to the Home Government Association. It was led by Isaac Butt and though extremely conservative and somewhat disunited, from it grew the formidable Irish Parliamentary Party of the 1880s. The change was due to the determined and forceful Charles Stewart Parnell who made the party cohesive, completely obedient to his wishes and a major force in Westminster. For not only was the Parnellite party quite prepared to disrupt the normally smooth running of the House of Commons it also had overwhelming electoral support in Ireland. Outside North-East Ulster and Trinity College, Dublin, every seat returned a nationalist. By holding the balance of power in 1885, it accelerated Gladstone's conversion to Home Rule. Parnell also managed to retain control of the agitation for land reform which emerged in the early 1880s and by 1889, with the discrediting of The Times' Pigott forgeries, his power was complete. The story of his subsequent fall in the wake of the O'Shea divorce case and his death while trying to rebuild his power is well known. However much Tories, and some Liberals, may have hoped that his removal from the public scene would mean the end of the party, it survived. It split into factions and never managed

to regain its pre-1890 unanimity, but the Irish constituencies continued to return Home Rulers.

Nonetheless, no successor with Parnell's remarkable gifts of leadership appeared. Justin McCarthy and John Redmond were liked and respected in the House of Commons as Parnell had never been, but they were neither feared nor heeded as Parnell had been. If they were also liked and respected in Ireland, they were seldom loved as Parnell had been. The period from 1890 to 1916 is more interesting for the other channels that Irish nationalism moved into than for the continuing history of the Parliamentary Party. The rise of the G.A.A., the language movement, the Abbey Theatre, Sinn Fein, the co-operative movement, all testified to the vigour of both political and intellectual life in Ireland. With the introduction of the third Home Rule Bill by Asquith in 1912, public attention returned to the party, while the reaction to it in Protestant Ulster showed that political life there was vigorous too. The concentration on the Bill up to August 1914, which kept Redmond in the forefront of attention, led people in Britain to believe, wrongly as events from 1916 were to show, that the party was still the dominant focus of nationalist aspirations. His decisions to allow the Bill to be suspended for the duration of the war and to defer consideration of the possible exclusion of Ulster until the end of the war, without consulting anyone in Ireland, further weakened his position, as did his support for the general British war effort. In 1918 the party was swept out of power in Ireland by Sinn Fein.

Scotland, by contrast with this turbulent and exciting political history, appeared very tranquil throughout the nineteenth century. As a leading modern Scottish historian has written: "For Scotland the Disruption was the most momentous single event of the nineteenth century ..." (1). This essentially, though not entirely religious, dispute remained important to the end of the century and beyond. Public opinion in Scotland, for example, was much roused by a legal quarrel between the Wee Frees and the United Free Church, arising out of the Disruption, which went to the House of Lords in 1904. Politically, Scotland was predominantly Liberal, though Glasgow, which prospered economically from the workings of the Empire, was more conservative. During the nineteenth century the phrase "North Britain" became a popular description of the country among the upper classes and often it seemed an accurate one. The national impulses in Scottish life remained dormant, many were tempted to pronounce them extinct.

Where Scotland was important towards the end of the century was in producing political, especially Liberal leaders. From the 1880s, the 5th Earl of Rosebery, Gladstone's eventual successor, was regarded as the rising star of the Liberal party. Intelligent and enormously rich, Rosebery lacked the staying power and political determination to be more than "The Man of Promise" (2); after a disastrous premiership, he tried to lead the party away from the Gladstonian commitment to Home Rule. His most intelligent and astute lieutenant in the Liberal Imperialist group he formed was

another Scot: R. B. Haldane. Haldane pursued a long and worthy career, eventually, and inevitably, deserting Rosebery's inaction for the government of another Scotsman - Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, whose father had been Lord Provost of Glasgow. Augustine Birrell's patronising remark to Asquith, that it was a wonderful thing that from the top of a hill in Fife you could see only acres represented in Parliament by a London barrister, seriously misread the situation. From Gladstone's great Midlothian campaign in 1879, which Rosebery managed, Liberalism often looked more to Scotland than London both for initiatives and for leaders.

On the Unionist side the only major figures were Arthur James Balfour and his brother Gerald. Both were involved with Ireland, A. J. Balfour making himself a reputation in the 1880s by tackling land agitation first in the Highlands and then in Ireland. For he was the second incumbent of the post of Scottish Secretary. Gladstone had created the ministry, though initially without Cabinet status, during his brief 1886 administration. At the same time a redistribution of seats gave Scotland a larger, and fairer number of M.P.s (3). The campaign for a Scottish Secretary was a curious form of aristocratic nationalism, being run by Rosebery and the Duke of Argyll. Their motivation remains rather obscure. Personally, their ambitions lay much higher than occupation of the post and there is little evidence of popular enthusiasm for the measure. Perhaps they wished to show their willingness to exercise their power on behalf of the country of which they were self-appointed spokesmen.

More serious Scottish nationalism, however, was about to undergo a revival. It had experienced a brief period of popularity in the 1850s. In his pamphlet on Ireland published after the defeat of the 1886 Home Rule Bill, Gladstone had mentioned the future possibility of a similar Bill for Scotland. This notion, of Irish Home Rule being a first instalment, was taken up by Scottish Liberals to a surprisingly large degree as early as 1886. The continuing preoccupation of the party with Home Rule kept the idea of Celtic nationalism constantly before them. A group emerged who called themselves the Young Scots. Led by J. W. Gulland, M.P. for Dumfries, and D. V. Pirie, Aberdeen North, they introduced a Scottish Home Rule Bill, modelled on the Irish one, every year from 1906. Their 1913 Bill received a second reading before it lapsed. The year before, Asquith had repeated Gladstone's promise of more Home Rule to come, in introducing the third Irish Bill. The concept of "Home Rule All Round" became increasingly popular and many saw some form of Federalism as the solution to the constitutional crisis that developed from 1912 to 1914. The leading exponent of Federalism, a prolific pamphleteer, was another Scot: Frederick Oliver. All these ideas, of course, came to nothing with the outbreak of the First World War.

Alongside the Liberals a group of more determined Scots Nationalists and Celticists came to prominence. Led by men such as Theodore Napier, Charles Waddie and T. D. Wanliss they published books and periodicals, notably the Fiery Cross, the Thistle and the Scottish Nation, advocating Home

Rule or complete independence. They were much influenced by Irish nationalism and devoted much attention to the Irish question. Ireland was, of course, the shining example of what a determined Celtic nationalism could achieve. At the same time, they were unable to suppress a certain resentment that the Irish demand was, perforce, taken extremely seriously, while theirs was not. Equally galling was the reluctance of the Irish to take them entirely seriously. Much as the Irish might sympathise with a sister Celtic nationalism, they disliked the idea of associating themselves with a movement that was both politically weak and often dominated by its cranky Jacobite wing.

The Scottish Celtic movement suffered from the same attitude. This group centred around Patrick Geddes and William Sharp, better known by his pseudonym Fiona Macleod, in Edinburgh. They found that the Irish Gaelic League would not have any links, officially at least, with the Pan-Celtic Congresses that they were so interested in promoting. Geddes' main orientation was to Scotland's Gaelic past and to her traditional links with the Continent, but he was interested in Ireland and invited Irish contributions to his periodical The Evergreen.

The other section of Scottish political life that came to support Home Rule for both Ireland and Scotland was the Labour movement. In 1886, when the Scottish Home Rule Association was founded, its first secretary was Ramsay MacDonald. In the years that followed the Labour interest

became increasingly important and it always maintained that Scottish control of domestic affairs was the best hope for the working-class. It was not until after the First World War that the Labour movement switched decisively to socialism in an all-Britain context. When they began to run candidates for Parliament, they soon discovered that a large section of the working-class was being skilfully used against them. Liberals kept the considerable Irish vote hostile with the cry that a vote for Labour was a vote against Irish Home Rule. Keir Hardie and his colleagues were soon at pains to stress their adherence to the Irish cause but they still tended to meet unfriendly demonstrations when campaigning in Irish areas. Like so many Scots they had run up against the formidable presence of the Irish in Scotland. Two men as different as Keir Hardie and Arthur Conan Doyle could both see their hopes of representing a Scottish constituency disappear in the Irish quarters. For many Scots attitudes to Ireland meant, in the first instance at least, attitudes to the Irish in Scotland.

There had been interchange of population between Scotland and Ireland "over most of the centuries of the Christian era" (4). The plantation of much of Ulster by Scottish Presbyterians at the beginning of the seventeenth century was an event of lasting significance for both countries. To Antrim came Scots from the Western Isles and in 1606 Sir Hugh Montgomery, a laird from Ayrshire, established a colony of Lowlanders in Co. Down. The following year James VI and I gave over large tracts of the rest of the

province to 'undertakers' and certain London companies who undertook to settle them with English and Scots. There is evidence that the inhabitants of Scotland and North-East Ireland saw themselves as all belonging to one country at this time. From the middle of the eighteenth century, however, the movement of population began to flow the other way. Initially Irish immigration into Scotland tended to be purely seasonal: labourers came, mostly from Donegal, to work on the Scottish harvest, returning home in the winter. The end of the century saw a high degree of support by advanced Scots for the radical United Irishmen movement in Ireland, a movement which had some parallels in Scotland.

It was the great famine of 1845-49 that brought about large scale Irish immigration into Scotland. There had been immigrants before but they tended to be people anxious to improve their positions. From 1845, as Handley relates, self-preservation replaces self-improvement as the incentive to emigration (5). Most famine emigrants from Ireland went to America, many via Scotland. Only those who found employment while there or who were too poor to pay the passage money to America settled in Scotland. The transient element makes it difficult to put an accurate figure on those who did stay. Handley calculated it to be in the region of 115,000 for the decade 1841-51. The second half of the century saw a population of Irish descent or birth of around 200,000 in Scotland, a figure which obviously continued to rise (6).

Generally, Antrim, the county nearest to Scotland, accounted for most of the country's Irish population, but Donegal, where the famine was particularly severe, provided a greater number of immigrants in the famine years. Substantial numbers also came from the rest of Ulster, the Dublin area and counties Mayo, Sligo and Leitrim in Connaught. They settled throughout the central belt of the country. The greatest concentration was in Glasgow and in the other large towns of the West such as Greenock and Port Glasgow. Many went to Dundee, and Edinburgh had an Irish community centred around the Cowgate of 25,000. The capital was one of the first towns to have an Irish quarter, founded when navvies came to work on the Union Canal from 1818. The Cowgate area was to produce one of Europe's most original socialist thinkers of the late nineteenth century: James Connolly. Nearly every Scottish town of any size had an Irish community before the end of the century, Aberdeen being a notable exception to this rule.

The Irish tended to hold the lowest jobs and to experience the worst living conditions. In the period 1850-1880 railway construction provided a major source of employment as did general building work. Most city improvements, such as the provision of water supplies and sewage, were made by Irish labour. In the West many went into heavy industry, the iron and steel works, or worked on the docks. In Ayrshire and Lanarkshire there were many Irish miners. For female immigrants, domestic service, as elsewhere in the world, was the main field of employment. Women could also

find jobs in the textile and woollen mills, though here conditions were exceptionally bad. In general all types of menial service, public and private, were often staffed by the Irish and much of this was only casual employment. Seasonal agricultural work continued to attract Irishmen, resident in both Scotland and Ireland, throughout the century.

If the Irish worked on city improvements, they were, nonetheless, the least likely to benefit from them. The packing of large numbers of people into small areas, in tenements never intended for such numbers, led to appalling housing conditions and endemic disease. Edinburgh's Cowgate became notorious but there were worse slums in Glasgow and Greenock. For all the nineteenth century the vast majority of the Irish remained near the bottom of the working class and their lives reflected it. From mid-century on they also became embroiled in disputes in their adopted country. First, they were by no means always united among themselves, bringing strong county allegiances with them from Ireland, allegiances that were kept up where the Irish from different areas congregated. Thus in Edinburgh, for example, the Donegal men usually held the better jobs and this led to friction. Secondly, the vast majority of the famine and post-famine immigrants were Catholics. Through traditional links there were also a substantial number of Protestant Irish resident in the West. Trouble often developed between the Orange and the Green and Greenock and Port Glasgow were infamous for the bad relations between the 2 communities.

The worst riot of this nature occurred in the Partick district of Glasgow in 1875.

Finally, of course, the Irish met with a great deal of nativism from the Scots. The Scots' horror at the invasion of the Irish was twofold: they objected to their poverty and they objected to their Catholicism. The wretched state of many of the famine immigrants led many Scots to fear that the "low" or "pauper" Irish, as they were commonly called, were to become an intolerable burden on Scotland. Poor Law administrators complained that the immigrants would not only "degrade" the nation but also cost an excessive amount in relief. They developed a habit of hustling those who did apply for relief back to Ireland without warning. Even those who had lived and worked for several years before unemployment forced them to apply sometimes found themselves on a steamer for Larne. The Scotsman which, almost alone of the press adopted a reasoning rather than hysterical approach to Irish immigration, pointed out that it was more than a little hypocritical to accept Irish labour but refuse to countenance Irish hardship.

Those who did get admitted to the poorhouse often found that they were subjected to long attacks on their religion. Militant Scottish Protestantism launched repeated and virulent campaigns against the influx of Papists into their land. The Irish suffered from the storm of anger that greeted the Papacy's planned restoration of the hierarchy in England in 1850, a storm stronger in Scotland than elsewhere

and stronger than that which greeted a similar announcement for Scotland some 28 years later. Two specifically anti-Catholic newspapers were founded in 1851: the Scottish Protestant and the Bulwark. Extreme and unplesant prejudice was by no means confined to a lunatic fringe. Two distinguished Scots were particularly associated with it: Hugh Miller, who edited an extremely vitriolic Edinburgh paper the Witness, and Thomas Guthrie, who would not allow any Catholic children in his ragged schools. Gradually, the prejudice against the Irish lessened in the second half of the century.

It is difficult to judge how much nativism was a result of Irish exclusiveness and concentration on specifically Irish issues, or how much this Irish attitude was a reaction to Scottish nativism. Certainly, the Irish remained wedded to the national demands and concerns of their homeland. With few, though often distinguished exceptions they continued to view politics in purely Irish terms. Their newspaper, the Glasgow Free Press, was fiercely nationalist and concerned almost exclusively with Irish news. The same remained true of later Irish papers, notably the Glasgow Observer, founded in 1885 (7). The Free Press' 2 main editors, A. H. Keane and Peter McCorry were also aggressively combative in their cause, and if the Scots had hoped to make the Irish abashed and docile by their scorn of them, they were disappointed. In particular, they attacked the Scottish leaders of the Catholic church with ferocity. With reference to the "Highlan' Clique" and slogans such as "Paddy sows but Sandy

reaps" they assailed the work of Bishops Scott and Murdoch (8). The situation was worsened by the dislike of the Scottish clergy for their Irish flock's nationalism. Scott vigorously opposed the paying of O'Connell's "Catholic Rent". In the 1860s many of the Irish were sympathetic to Fenianism, though the extent of Fenian activity was greatly exaggerated by a fearful Scottish press.

From the 1870s they embraced Home Rule with enthusiasm. The Home Rule movement brought to the fore a remarkable leader: John Ferguson. Ferguson was a Protestant from near Belfast who came to Glasgow in 1860 where he became a publisher. He believed that the Irish in mainland Britain should support Isaac Butt and his Home Government Association. He got Butt to come and address a meeting in Glasgow which was a considerable success. In the wake of the meeting he started founding branches of the movement. He became Butt's most useful supporter in Britain and the leading organiser of the Irish in Scotland. He chaired the first annual convention of branches in Manchester in 1873 and organised another great Glasgow meeting with Butt in 1876. But Ferguson was much more radical than Butt, both in Irish terms and in Scottish: he believed that the immigrants had a duty to support causes that were important to the working-class of Scotland, as well as Irish nationalism. In May 1877, he invited Parnell and Joseph Biggar up to Glasgow to explain their parliamentary tactic of obstruction and at the annual convention later in the year, held in Liverpool, he swung the Home Rule Confederation round to Parnell. Eventually

this move was to bring Parnell to the leadership of the whole Irish people. Ferguson also admired Michael Davitt and his advanced ideas about land; Davitt too spoke under his auspices in Glasgow and Ferguson was present at the first meeting of the Irish National Land League (9).

This thesis is not a study of the Irish in Scotland. Rather it will look at the attitudes of the various Scottish political groupings mentioned above towards Ireland. In most cases this will mean attitudes to the Irish in Ireland, not the Irish immigrants in Scotland. These attitudes will be approached through the leaders of the Scottish people, each representative of a definably different political point of view. It will also examine the Scottish newspaper press and periodicals, and some Scottish imaginative writers, where a distinctive and illuminating attitude to Ireland is to be found.

Finally, by way of introduction, a word should be said on the political composition of Scotland. Scotland was predominantly a Liberal country. The Redistribution Act of 1885 gave her 72 members. In the general election of that year 62 of those seats were taken by Liberals. Turning to the other end of our period, we find the position virtually unchanged: the Liberals holding 61 of the seats in both of the 1910 general elections. On only one occasion, however, had Unionists succeeded in gaining a majority of the Scottish constituencies: at the so-called Khaki Election of 1900 (10).

This Liberal dominance, however, should not obscure the fact that, initially at least, Liberal Unionism made a considerable impact in Scotland. Of the 62 Scottish Liberals elected in 1885, 52 stood again in the election the next year which followed the defeat of the first Home Rule Bill. Thirty two of these remained loyal to Gladstone, while 20 defected and stood as Liberal Unionists. Twelve of the defectors were successful, and Liberal Unionism also picked up a further 5 seats with new candidates. With a total of 17 members, Liberal Unionism had been proportionally less successful than it had in England, but not dramatically so. Considering Scotland's traditional Liberalism, and the enormous respect and esteem for Gladstone in Scotland, Liberal Unionism had done surprisingly well; a great deal better, for example, than it had done in Wales, Liberalism's other stronghold. Too much should not be made of this however. Over a third of the defectors, to look at it a different way, had been rejected by their constituents; whereas only 3 of the 32 Gladstonians who stayed loyal were rejected by theirs. And the Liberal Unionist representation fell sharply to 11 in the 1892 election. They never exceeded their initial figure of 17 members, and only once managed again to equal it: in 1900 when the Liberal vote in Scotland collapsed. Though Liberal Unionism established itself as a force in Scottish politics, it remains valid to refer to Scotland as predominantly a Gladstonian Liberal country throughout this period.

CHAPTER 2: SCOTTISH HOME RULE 1880-1900

> The man that gets drunk is little else than a fool and is in the habit, no doubt, of advocating Home Rule.
>
> William McGonagall

The years 1885 to 1914 were the years of Home Rule. The Irish issue polarised and embittered politics as no issue had since the Corn Laws. Even in the years from 1893 to 1911, when Ireland and Home Rule were not among the main crusading platforms of either party, they always remained a central problem that would have to be faced eventually. Only perhaps during the Boer War did any other issue dominate politics as Ireland did.

The Irish Home Rule movement was a combination of a vigorous Celtic nationalism in Ireland, and a vigorous parliamentary nationalism at Westminster. This combination was of so formidable a nature that it should not be surprising that it produced comparable nationalisms in Scotland and Wales. In fact, it is worth remarking that it is as useful to ask why Scottish and Welsh nationalism were not stronger at the end of the nineteenth century, as it is to ask why they appeared at all. As one recent Marxist writer has observed, the "feebleness and political ambiguity" of nineteenth century Scottish nationalism is "remarkable in any wider perspective" (1).

It is, of course, wrong to talk of Irish nationalism producing Scottish nationalism. Scotland had its own distinctive nationalist tradition, stemming from opposition to the Union

of 1707. The most famous manifestations of it were the Jacobite risings of 1715 and 1745, though it would be inaccurate to describe them as purely nationalist movements. The immediate precursor of the events described in this chapter was the National Association for the Vindication of Scottish Rights, formed in 1853. Its leaders were the Rev. James Begg, the historian and novelist James Grant, Duncan McLaren and the writer W. E. Aytoun, author of the immensely successful Lays of the Scottish Cavaliers. Though the Association was not allied to any party, and did include some Conservatives, McLaren was the leader of the Scottish Liberals, a pointer to future developments. In November 1853 the Association held a meeting in Edinburgh, at which some town councils and the Convention of Royal Burghs were represented. Five resolutions were passed, including demands for increased Scottish representation in parliament and the restoration of the office of Secretary of State for Scotland, abolished after the forty-five. Another meeting, held the following month in Glasgow and attended by 5,000 people, went further in demanding a Scottish Assembly or Parliament to deal with purely Scottish questions (2).

The National Association did not last very long. It failed to attract the support of either of the political parties; and the limited public attention it received soon switched to the Crimean War. Interestingly it also found that the example of Ireland proved a problem. It was 6 years since the death of Daniel O'Connell, but the memory of his campaign for repeal of the Union between England and Ireland, and of the

remarkable popular movement that he united behind him, was still fresh. Though the National Association never suggested the repeal of the 1707 Union, the parliament they sought for Scotland was intended to be subordinate to Westminster, their opponents delighted in making derisive comparisons with Ireland. In particular this was true of The Scotsman and its editor Alexander Russel who, as well as describing them as "a few unknowns constituting themselves an aggrieved and indignant nation", referred to them as the "Scotch Repealers" and the "Scoto-Irish Party" (3).

The Scottish Home Rule Movement of the later nineteenth century was also to find Ireland a difficulty. The fact that Ireland so obviously provided their inspiration led mischevious Unionists to taunt them with suggestions of rebelliousness and disloyalty, which infuriated the worthy and eminently respectable Liberals who were always so careful to stress their affection for crown and empire. To increase their confusion, their careful loyalty had the distressing result that they were seldom taken entirely seriously by either Governments at Westminster or Nationalists in Ireland. Nonetheless the Home Rule and Nationalist movements were stronger in Scotland in the period from 1886 to the First World War, than is usually remembered today.

> The Imperial Parliament must be supreme in these three Kingdoms, and nothing that creates a doubt upon that supremacy can be tolerated by any intelligent or patriotic mind. But, subject to that limitation, if we can make arrangements under which Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and portions of England, can deal with questions of local and special interest to themselves more

> efficiently than Parliament now can, that, I say, will be the attainment of great national good ... I will consent to give to Ireland no principle, nothing that is not to be given on equal terms to Scotland and to different parts of the Kingdom; and I say that the man who shall devise machinery by which some portion of the excessive and impossible tasks now laid upon the House of Commons shall be shifted to the more free, and, therefore, more efficient hands of secondary and local authorities will confer a blessing upon his country which will entitle him to be reckoned among the permanent benefactors of his time.

W. E. Gladstone speaking in Dalkeith during the first, and most famous, Midlothian campaign in 1879. This declaration was greeted, according to The Times correspondent, with "loud and prolonged cheering" (4). The Times leader, while not condemning Gladstone's suggestion, was noncommittal. More enthusiastic was The Scotsman, whose editor Charles Cooper, was helping Lord Rosebery in the management of the Midlothian campaign (5).

Rosebery and Cooper were to pursue the possibility of devolution for Scotland over the next 6 years. The detailed history of their manoeuverings on Scotland's behalf is given below in chapter 5. By 1886 they had succeeded in securing the restoration of the office of Scottish Secretary, when the whole question of devolution took a dramatic new turn with Gladstone's conversion to Irish Home Rule.

Despite his assurance at Midlothian that he would give Ireland "nothing that is not to be given on equal terms to Scotland", Gladstone did not mention Scotland at all in his monumental speech of over 3 hours introducing the Irish Home Rule Bill. Scotland came up once during the ensuing debate on the Bill, G. J. Goschen asking a question about the

implications of the measure for Scotland. Goschen was at the time a Scottish member, having been elected for Edinburgh East in 1885. He had been at odds with much of the Liberal party for some time due to his right wing opinions, and had declared his opposition to Home Rule. He was to lose his Edinburgh seat in the 1886 election and return south of the border for the rest of his career after this brief and not very satisfactory spell as a Scottish M.P. (6).

Replying to his question, Gladstone said:

> What I ventured to say was this - that the deliberate and Constitutional expression of the wishes of Ireland through the vast majority of her members entails upon this House the duty and the obligation of a respectful and a favourable consideration of every wish that Ireland may entertain, consistently with the interests and the integrity of the Empire. My right hon. Friend said there was a parity in principle between Ireland and Scotland. I entirely agree with him. His experience as a Scotch member is short. If the vast majority of Scotchmen demand something on the ground that Scotch feeling and opinion show that it is essentially required in order to satisfy the just wishes of Scotland, I would advise my right hon. Friend, if he wishes to be consistent with regard to the integrity of the Empire, not to put himself in conflict with those expressions of opinion (7).

What this rather cryptic declaration meant, quite apart from its careful respect for the determination of Scots, was that while there was indeed a parity of principle between Ireland and Scotland, the Irish were demanding Home Rule at the present moment and the Scots were not. Without being unduly cynical, one can also remark that when he spoke at Midlothian he was, though clearly interested in the question, offering Home Rule to no-one in practical terms. It was, therefore, easy to offer it equally to Scotland and Ireland. When,

7 years later, Home Rule became an actual proposal, Gladstone, realising the acute difficulties he was to have to put it through for Ireland, was understandably reluctant to further complicate the issue by including Scotland. It was also undeniable that there was no overwhelming demand for it in Scotland, as there was in Ireland.

In August 1886, after the defeat of the Home Rule Bill and the loss of the ensuing general election, Gladstone issued a pamphlet: The Irish Question. In it he explained that he had considered devolution of some sort for about 15 years. He continued:

> But I have considered it to be a question involving such an amount and such a kind of change, and likely to be encountered with so much of prejudice apart from reason, as to make it a duty to look rigidly to the conditions, upon the fulfillment of which alone it could warrantably be entertained.

He listed 6 such conditions, of which the fourth was that it would not be "allowable to deal with Ireland upon any principle, the benefit of which could not be allowed to Scotland in circumstances of equal and equally clear desire". He then mentioned one of the crucial problems for any Home Rule scheme, though he did not offer any solution to it, that England held the power to veto Home Rule in the Commons.

> ... if England thinks one way in the proportion of three to one, she can outvote Scotland, Ireland, and Wales together, although they were each and all to return the whole of their members to vote against her.

The point about parity of principle he had of course made before, and the remark about England outvoting the Celtic nations was obvious enough. Two pages later, however, he

went rather further in a lengthy passage about "sense of nationality" and the possibility of federalism.

> What is not less likely, and even more important, is that the sense of nationality, both in Scotland and in Wales, set astir by this controversy, may take a wider range than heretofore. Wales, and even Scotland, may ask herself, whether the present system of intrusting all their affairs to the handling of a body, English in such overwhelming proportion as the present Parliament is, and must probably always be, is an adjustment which does the fullest justice to what is separate and specific in their several populations. Scotland, which for a century and a quarter after her Union was refused all taste of a real representative system, may begin to ask herself whether, if at the first she felt something of an unreasoning antipathy, she may not latterly have drifted into a superstitious worship, or at least an irreflective acquiescence. Of two things I feel assured. First, whatever practical claims either of these countries may make on their own behalf will be entertained and disposed of without stirring up the cruel animosities, the unworthy appeals to selfishness, the systematic misrepresentations, which have told so fearfully against Ireland. And, secondly, that the desire for Federation, floating in the minds of many, has had an unexpected ally in the Irish policy of 1886; and that, if the thing, which that term implies, contains within itself possibilities of practical good, the chance of bringing such possibilities to bear fruit has thus been unexpectedly and largely improved (8).

Unlikely though it may seem, this rather heavy and ponderous declaration caused considerable excitement in Scottish radical and advanced circles. Following the publication of the pamphlet, a Scottish Home Rule Association was founded in 1886. The problem as far as Gladstone was concerned, as we shall see, was that he was encouraging expectations that he was not prepared to satisfy. The S.H.R.A. had its headquarters in Edinburgh and was formed as a pressure group for Scottish devolution. Like its predecessor of the 1850s, it was to be a non-party organisation, though it was to be increasingly dominated by the Liberals.

The Chairman of the committee of the new association however was a Tory nationalist, Professor John Stuart Blackie. Blackie held the chair of Greek at Edinburgh University, and was a well-known and distinctive personality in Scotland. Frequently strongly anti-English, he was a keen supporter of the Gaelic language and came to Scottish nationalism not through an interest in Ireland but through an interest in the Scottish Highlands. He had been instrumental in the founding of a chair of Celtic studies at Edinburgh in 1882, had championed the Crofters and had published 2 books on the Highland question: Altavona (1882) and The Scottish Highlanders and the Land Laws (1885). Determinedly outspoken, and at times aggressive and querulous, Blackie enjoyed his reputation of flamboyance and eccentricity. He delighted in attacking Calvinist theology by refusing to admit that all men, and particularly himself, were sinners. He had visited Ireland in 1883 while pursuing his researches into Land Laws and had returned with a profound sympathy for the Irish tenantry. But he could not accept the Home Rule Bill and became the only notable Scottish nationalist to oppose it vigorously (9).

Dr. G. B. Clark was the President of the S.H.R.A., the General Secretary was Charles Waddie, an Edinburgh printer, and the Treasurer William Mitchell. The latter 2 were Liberals though they were to resign from the party, feeling that the Liberals were too slow and cautious on Scottish Home Rule. Between them they were responsible for the bulk of the pamphlets that the Association published. Theodore Napier, a romantic Jacobite nationalist, who will be discussed later,

was for periods Assistant Secretary; and the third Marquess of Bute, proprietor of the Scottish Review, was also closely associated with the group.

By the early 1890s the Association had built up an impressive list of Vice-Presidents, a good half of whom were Liberal M.P.s or candidates. These included Cunninghame Graham, Augustine Birrell, W. A. Hunter and the members for East Aberdeenshire, Elgin and Nairn, East Perthshire, Dundee, Wick, Ross and Cromarty, Glasgow Camlachie and Inverness-shire. Even J. W. Phillips, the Welsh barrister who defeated Keir Hardie at Mid-Lanark, joined, anxious to prove his interest and enthusiasm in matters Scottish.

As a pressure group, the S.H.R.A. was active in publishing pamphlets to promote its cause. Several of these publications will now be examined to see how they treat Ireland and what use they made of the Irish example. Obviously the main thrust of all the work the Association published was that Scotland needed Home Rule, though the authors differed as to exactly how it was to be achieved.

In 1888 "Scotland and Home Rule" was published by William Mitchell, the Treasurer; this pamphlet was a reprint of an article in Bute's Scottish Review (April 1888). Mitchell argued for an Imperial Parliament and 3 local parliaments for the 3 kingdoms, Wales presumably was to be put in with England. He did not concede that Ireland should have priority, though he felt she deserved greater sympathy than Scotland, not only because she had suffered more from

misgovernment, but also because she did not even have the compensation of the memory of a strong independent tradition. The defeat of Gladstone's Irish Home Rule Bill was not entirely to be regretted, for it now gave him the chance to return with a full federalist bill "in a single measure". Anyway, Mitchell argued, Scottish Home Rulers would have "rejected with scorn" Gladstone's Bill if they had been in Ireland, as it would have "deprived them of all say in the government of the great British Empire which Irishmen have contributed by their blood to win and cement" (10). In a remarkably naive, or disingenuous, passage he then considered the extraordinary idea that Ireland might even welcome a total separation as "had sometimes been foolishly suggested". Mitchell also devoted some space to a speech by Lord Salisbury that particularly infuriated him. In it, Salisbury had encouraged the Irish to be more like the Scots: contented and proud of the Union (11).

Several of the points Mitchell made are worth consideration, as they will reappear frequently in Scottish nationalist writings. It is hard to ignore the impression that he did not greatly like Ireland: he discussed at length, for example, the contention that the Irish were not fit for self-government. He treated Ireland with an air of condescension, especially in the assertion that, unlike Scotland, she had no tradition of parliamentary independence. In a sense this was a way of getting back at Irish nationalists who, in their turn, were condescending about the weakness of the Scottish call for Home Rule. As Lord Bute wrote bitterly in another

pamphlet: "The Irish themselves have no wish for any association, far less fusion .... It was Mr. Parnell who thought it best to say: 'Scotland has ceased to be a nation'" (12).

Mitchell's plea had determinedly pressed for simultaneous Home Rule all round. All the Scottish nationalist authors agreed on this demand, though they frequently differed on the form Home Rule should take. As another S.H.R.A. pamphlet put it:

> That an unconquered nation like Scotland should give precedence to England's conquered province Ireland, is a most monstrous and arrogant assumption.... Scotland, however, desires no precedence over Ireland or England or Wales in the matter of Home Rule; but if there must be separate Bills for the four nations, then they must all come into simultaneous operation (13).

The resentment towards Ireland was clear in this pamphlet for the anonymous author continued: "if there is any precedence, then Scotland ought to get it from having had to endure the wrong so much longer". The idea even surfaced in another S.H.R.A. publication that the Irish had only themselves to blame:

> It cannot for a moment be contested that the Scottish people have suffered anything like the heaped-up injustice and brutal tyranny to which their brother Celts were subjected in Ireland, and that for a very sufficient reason. Scotsmen would not have quietly submitted to such brutality for a single day. Their oppressors would soon have discovered that the old spirit of Scottish Independence was neither dead nor sleeping. The heather would soon be ablaze, and the fiery torch, carried from hill to hill, would rouse both Lowland Scot and Highland Clansman (14).

Not only was it "monstrous" to propose Home Rule for Ireland alone, it should be borne in mind, some Scottish nationalists

argued, that Ireland was already better treated than Scotland. Several pamphlets set out to demonstrate that the financial workings of government favoured Ireland at the expense of Scotland and that recent legislation "put the Irish agriculturist in a position to be envied by every tiller of the soil in Scotland" (15). Financially, the Irish had even managed to do better out of the 2 Acts of Union:

> As regards the bribery and corruption which were undoubtedly used by English ministers to promote both Unions, the only difference between the cases of Scotland and Ireland consists in the fact that the Scotch were bribed with a small sum, ... while the Irish were bribed with an enormous sum of British money (16).

Above all, the resentment of the fact that Ireland was being offered Home Rule while Scotland was not was based on the contention that such a decision "appears to set a premium upon disorder", as yet another pamphlet put it (17). Statements like that of Lord Salisbury quoted above by Mitchell were a perennial irritant to Scottish nationalists. They denied vigorously that the Scots were contented. Rather, the Scots were a calm, loyal and law-abiding nation who put forward their just and much needed demands in a cool and rational manner; and it was quite wrong that they should be penalised and ignored for it.

Mitchell had proposed 4 parliaments for Britain. There was no overall S.H.R.A. scheme for devolution at this time. Some argued for an extension of the 1886 Home Rule Bill to embrace Scotland, some put forward no concrete suggestions and concentrated only on Scottish grievances. One writer even proposed "provincial councils" instead: these would have provided Home

Rule with a vengeance, with a total of 15 such councils (18). The S.H.R.A. publications bristle with such practical absurdities and with vague calls for the restoration of Scotland's national honour and national spirit. As well as resentment, they also contained much genuine sympathy for Ireland's plight and enthusiasm for the prospect of a rejuvenated Ireland. But much of it seemed to betray an extraordinary naivety: they either failed to understand the depth of Irish feeling on nationalism, or they deliberately played it down. Only their obvious sincerity, and love for their country, prevented their vision of a handful of sober-sided Scottish patriots leading the Irish to a general Celtic Home Rule and a happy brotherly Imperial Parliament, from looking ludicrous.

The part played by the S.H.R.A. in the Mid-Lanark by-election of 1888 will be discussed in chapter 4 below. At this election the Association was opposed to the Liberals, but this was an isolated exception: in general, the Scottish Liberals were also to become the proponents of Scottish Home Rule. Indeed, it would be quite wrong to accept the picture of themselves as lonely and dedicated voices crying in the wilderness, projected by the S.H.R.A. pamphleteers. Their cause had the backing of nearly all the backbench Scottish Liberals, which often meant the majority of Scottish M.P.s.

On April 9 1889 Dr G. B. Clark introduced a resolution into the Commons calling for Scottish Home Rule. Clark was the President of the S.H.R.A. and a leading Scottish radical. A

doctor resident in London, his especial interest lay in the land question. He was an early champion of the Crofters Movement, and one of the small group of "Crofters M.P.s" elected in 1885. The following year he converted to Gladstonian Liberalism and was re-elected for the same constituency, Caithness, under that flag. Unlike J. S. Blackie, he was also a keen supporter of the Irish Party, he became quite friendly with Parnell, and of Irish Home Rule. In 1882 he had written a pamphlet calling for land nationalisation, in which he showed that he was thoroughly aware of rural poverty in Ireland as well as in the Scottish Highlands:

> The history of Ireland during the present century is also a record of landlord misrule, of terrible cruelty and inhumanity, of grinding tyranny and oppression. In the name of law and under its sacred sanction, they have inflicted the grossest injustice and the most intolerable wrong upon their unfortunate tenantry, so that now the very name of Irish landlord is a byeword and a reproach. The people have been exorbitantly rack-rented and kept in a state of absolute misery and degradation; they have been half starved, badly housed, and lived in rags and wretchedness, in order that the landlords may squander the wealth they have created in luxury and, too often, in debauchery and vice (19).

In introducing his resolution for Scottish Home Rule however, Clark was the epitome of moderation. He assured the House that he was not attacking the Union or calling for its repeal. The Union had been a "good thing for Scotland", though a "better thing for England". The Scots had been the builders of the Empire, they did not deserve to have their nationality ignored and insulted. Scottish business was neglected in Parliament; when it was discussed "Scotch opinion is overwhelmed by uneducated English opinion. Hon. Members vote at

the bidding of the Whips on Scotch questions when they know as much of Scotch politics as they do of the politics of the moon". He said that the only logical answer to assuage national opinion and to combat the pressure of parliamentary business was Federalism. Turning to Ireland, he cleverly tried to appeal for Irish support by crediting his faith in federalism to an Irish leader: "The only solution is that which Mr. Butt proposed many years ago, and it was that proposal which converted me to his views on Home Rule in 1874". Further, and this was of course a central point, he was prepared to concede Ireland priority:

> ... some of our Scotch friends think that pushing forward Scotch Home Rule will retard Irish Home Rule. But I would keep back Home Rule in Scotland for half a century rather than put off Home Rule in Ireland for a year. Ireland has much more need of it, she has suffered more, and the Irish evil is a national evil to be averted.

It was presumably on the question of priority that Waddie and Mitchell resigned from the Liberal party, for, as we have seen, they were not prepared to let Ireland go forward first and alone.

The motion was seconded by Dr. W. A. Hunter (Aberdeen North), an S.H.R.A. Vice-President (20). He claimed that Scottish opinion favoured Home Rule, though admitting that the subject had been little discussed in the press. He spoke of the benefits of federalism and pointed out that it worked well in America. On Ireland, he too stated that they were happy for Scotland to wait her turn after Ireland. Hunter closed a very low key speech by observing that he regretted that they did not expect their resolution to succeed this time.

> Although we do not expect a majority of the House on this motion, we have nevertheless opened up a question of interest to the great mass of the people, and one which at no distant day will be ripe for treatment by Parliament.

There followed 2 speeches against the motion. M. H. Shaw Stewart (Conservative, Renfrewshire East) suggested that the proposals were too ill-defined and vague to be taken seriously; the promotion of the Scottish Secretary to the Cabinet would satisfy reasonable Scottish opinion and be a practical alternative. A. R. D. Elliott (Liberal Unionist, Roxburghshire) had discovered a conspiracy. He told the House of the existence of the S.H.R.A. and of Clark's Presidency of it: it was clear that the proposers were really separatists, not Home Rulers. It was a cry that must have sounded familiar to the Irish members.

Donald Crawford (Gladstonian Liberal, Lanarkshire North East) said he had some sympathy for the idea though he would vote against. He drew a clear distinction between Scotland and Ireland. Ireland's complaint was that " ... measures are forced upon her which she abhors and detests". This was not Scotland's problem: she had never been "oppressed or insulted", "merely not got as much legislation as she requires"; " ... the business of Scotland has been entirely neglected by this House". Crawford was obviously some way on the road to conversion, but was for the moment sticking with his leader who rose to speak after a typically trenchant contribution by R. B. Cunninghame Graham (21).

Gladstone's speech was the first reference he had made to Scottish Home Rule since writing The Irish Question. He began by reiterating his declaration over principle:

> I hold that Scotland and Ireland are precisely equal in the face of England with respect to their moral and political right to urge on the Imperial Parliament such claims as they may consider arise out of the interests and demands of those respective countries.

Though he was forced to admit that England had denied Home Rule to Ireland, he believed that the English would not oppose Scotland if she claimed Home Rule "by a clearly preponderating voice".

> The English are a very brave nation, but they also possess that prudence which is the better part of valour, and which would prevent them from placing themselves in conflict with the deliberate and thoroughly formed Scotch opinion upon a case of this kind.

In practical terms, however, the problems of Scotland and Ireland were very different. The Scottish Union was not founded, as the Irish one was, on a "combination of fraud and force", and all Scotland really needed was more parliamentary time for her business. This could be provided but were the Liberals to declare for Scottish Home Rule the chance for reform would be lost. This time was not right: the Scots should wait until Home Rule was operational in Ireland and seen to be working. Then, if a majority wanted it, and if Scotland still had strong grievances, the time would be right to consider extending Home Rule. Gladstone's lack of enthusiasm, though it cannot have been a complete surprise, must have been a disappointment to Clark and his allies since, as we have seen, he had played a large part in encouraging Scottish Home Rule aspirations. Gladstone, of course, hoped

fervently to be able to put Irish Home Rule through before he retired, or died; he was understandably reluctant to further encumber the issue by adding Scotland.

Gladstone having spoken the Government made its views known. Arthur James Balfour, as both a Scot and the Chief Secretary for Ireland, was chosen to express unequivocal opposition for the Unionists. Balfour remarked briskly that there was no demand for Home Rule in Scotland, and then turned to attack Gladstone who, he remarked, seemed to be having difficulty in deciding if he was in favour of the proposition or against it. He was bringing "bad history to the rescue of bad politics" in his comments on the Unions. There were in fact strong similarities in the passing of the 2 Unions, and he readily admitted that the Union had been unpopular in Scotland. The point was that the Scots had been converted by the obvious benefits it had brought. He supposed that "socialistic agitation" was at the bottom of it as, he added for good measure, it was at the bottom of most of the demand for Home Rule in Ireland.

After 2 more speeches, Dr. R. Wallace (Gladstonian Liberal Edinburgh East) moved an amendment to the resolution that Home Rule should be granted "at such time and of such a character as may be desired by the Scottish people". He suggested that at the moment the majority of the Scottish people favoured Home Rule for Ireland, but not for themselves. As yet the Scots had had no opportunity to discuss the question or express their opinions on it: his amendment would

allow for this opportunity while keeping the idea alive. The proposers accepted the amendment, and the House then voted on the resolution with it: it was defeated 200 votes to 79 (22).

In all, there were to be 15 debates on Scottish Home Rule by 1914. Some patterns which had emerged in this debate were to recur throughout the period. First, and most obviously, there was to be continued and steadfast opposition by virtually all Unionist speakers. The Irish members tended to remain aloof and non-committal though, as we shall see, watchful that their claim remained pre-eminent. Backbench Liberals favoured Scottish Home Rule, strongly if they came from Scotland, vaguely if from England. Some Welsh Liberals hoped to bring in their country too. The Liberal leadership were prepared to admit that the demand had some validity, but had more pressing questions to worry about. Labour was in favour. These generalisations tend to hold good for most of the contributions to all the debates. This is not surprising and the reactions are much what one would expect since Scottish Home Rule was not being considered just on its own merits. The whole question of Home Rule had already polarised over Ireland, and Scotland was forced into the existing pattern.

While Scottish Home Rule was being discussed, plans were well advanced in the organisation of an event that was to heighten the sense of Scottish consciousness further: the visit of Charles Stewart Parnell to Edinburgh. He had been invited by the Liberal majority on the Edinburgh Town Council to come

and receive the freedom of the city. It was the dramatic events in the Special Commission in February 1889, when Parnell had finally been acquitted of condoning the Phoenix Park murders, that prompted the Edinburgh Liberals to ask him. The revelation of the Pigott forgeries had produced a wave of feeling for Parnell throughout Liberal Britain, and the Edinburgh offer was one feature of it. There was considerable opposition to the idea from Scottish Unionists and a considerable controversy arose, with the Liberal Unionist Lord Provost of Edinburgh declining to attend. The Council, however, stuck to their decision and on July 19 Parnell arrived (23).

Opposition to the visit centred on the fact that not only was Parnell not a suitable person to be so honoured by Scotland's capital, but the decision to make him a freeman had been taken in London. The opponents indulged in some Scottish nationalism themselves in alleging that it was Schnadhorst, the national Liberal agent, who had decreed that the freedom should be offered. This made a good rallying-point for the Unionists, but it greatly misrepresented the situation. The Edinburgh Liberals' offer was made before Parnell was elected a life member of the National Liberal Club in London, the gesture that marked the official leadership's blessing on the period of enthusiasm for Parnell which was to last from the unmasking of Pigott to the revelations of the divorce court. It is more likely that the Edinburgh Liberals were acknowledging Parnell's decision to sue The Times through the Scottish courts. Having decided to pursue The Times for libel,

Parnell declared that he could expect no justice from an English court, and had issued his writ in Edinburgh. His belated decision to sue led directly to the establishment of the Special Commission: since the affair of the forged letters had in a sense started in Edinburgh, it was quite logical for Liberals in Edinburgh to wish to set the seal on its ending. In any event, much of what was said during the visit by the Scottish Liberals had a definitely Scottish and independent air that would not have appealed particularly to Gladstone or Schnadhorst.

Parnell arrived in Edinburgh on July 19. That evening he addressed a large open air meeting on Calton Hill. He told the meeting that it was not so much a demonstration in his honour as a demonstration in favour of Gladstone's Irish policy. The presentation of the freedom of the city took place in the Council chamber the next day, with 21 councillors attending. It was followed by a meeting in the Corn Exchange in the Grassmarket, which provided an opportunity for Liberals from all over Scotland to honour the Irish leader. The proceedings of this meeting are fully documented, as the Edinburgh United Liberal Committee produced a commemorative book, copies of which were distributed to all those attending. Entitled Scotland's Welcome to Mr. Parnell, it bore as its subtitle "A Souvenir of his First Political Visit to Scotland". It was not in fact his first political visit; he had been several times to Glasgow to address meetings of the Irish resident there. It was an interesting illustration of the blank in the Scottish mind about their Irish immigrants that

it should be so described. The chair in the Corn Exchange was taken by Lord Aberdeen, who had been Liberal Viceroy of Ireland in 1886. Among the speakers were Herbert Gladstone and William McEwan, an M.P. from the Edinburgh brewing family; and, on the Irish side, Justin McCarthy and of course Parnell himself. All the speeches were routine enough. Parnell was in moderate vein and amused his listeners by remarking that he feared they only ever heard bad about him. The proceedings were interspersed with 3 songs: a specially written "Welcome to Parnell!"; the National Anthem with an extra verse on Ireland's sufferings; and a splendid version of "Scots Wha Hae" the first line of which was "Scots Wha Hae wi' Gladstone fought".

The real interest of the meeting lies in the commemorative book, Scotland's Welcome to Mr. Parnell. The volume opens with an unsigned account of Parnell's life. The life is quite critical of Gladstone in places and also criticises Parnell for not taking the trouble to explain the inequities of the Irish land system to the peoples of England and Scotland when he threw himself into the work of the Land League. It is also at pains to distance Scotland from misrule in Ireland. Reference is always made to "English misrule" and, on the election that followed the defeat of the Home Rule Bill it says that "Scotland and Wales kept true to their colours.... Thus England alone pronounced against the Home Rule policy, and by such a parliamentary majority as to render of no avail, for the time at least, the favourable verdict of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales". A. J. Balfour is

castigated for coercion, though the author could have found a more modern parallel than: "Indeed Mr. Balfour has treated the Nationalists of Ireland very much as Claverhouse did the Covenanters of Scotland".

After a brief account of the circumstances surrounding Parnell's visit to Edinburgh, the speeches of the proposer and seconder in the Council were reproduced. Councillor Pollard, the seconder, said that:

> Edinburgh had had within her walls men who had shed their blood and given their lives to buy the freedom and the liberties which they enjoyed to-day, and it was the glory of the city that she was the capital of the Scottish people whose history was the history of the struggle of the Commons for civil and religious liberty. He thought that it was meet that the citizens of Edinburgh, whose nation in the early golden days before the long centuries of English misrule began in Ireland, received from Ireland messages of goodwill and the gospel of peace, when they again saw the Irish people stretching out their hands towards them with affection, and with evident desire for brotherly love and union, to wish to be the first to do what they could to seal this union in the face of the world.

This identification of the Scots with the Irish in the face of English opposition was again referred to in the conclusion of the account:

> With every day that passes, the friendship between Liberal and Nationalist becomes more intimate, and their alliance more efficient. The democracies of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales are already bound together by the indissoluble bonds of respect and love. Ere long the democracy of England will step into line with the sister countries, and then, after centuries of suffering and strife, a true union will be established, enduring as are the eternal principles of love and justice.

The remainder of the book is taken up with printing the 146 addresses of welcome from all over Scotland which were read at the meeting. Tedious as these must have been to

listen to, especially as so many of them are similar, they provide a valuable picture of what the Scots were thinking of Ireland at the time. In particular, they are important for the way in which the Scots were using the Irish experience and relating it to their own country. Nineteen of the addresses came from purely Irish bodies, branches of the Irish National League, and are therefore not really relevant here. One may just remark that they are all purely Irish Nationalist and make no reference to Scotland at all.

Most of the addresses were from local Liberal Associations. They tended to follow a pattern, usually dwelling on the cunning and unscrupulousness of Parnell's enemies in promoting the Pigott forgeries, and congratulating him on the vindication of his character. While expressing support for quite radical measures, they were generally conservative in tone with regards to Home Rule, stressing Parnell's work in channelling nationalist agitation into more constitutional forms. Much is made of the "mutual understanding" that now exists between the 2 countries. Scotland, Parnell is constantly assured, looks forward to the Irish getting Home Rule and thus settling down and becoming loyal and enthusiastic members of the Empire. When Home Rule comes, the Irish people "will enjoy, without let or hindrance, the sense and the pride of nationality which the people of Scotland have never lost". Thus, primly and patronisingly, the Scottish Liberal Association. More optimistically, the Edinburgh Southern Liberals announced that: "Henceforth it will be impossible for men, however malignant and unscrupulous, to

turn to political purposes ancient misunderstandings, mainly due to race prejudice and religious bigotry".

Not all of the addresses, however, were simply predictable. Some of the more advanced bodies took an approving line towards Parnell for the things he had done for Scotland, as well as for what he had achieved for Ireland. Three of the Liberal Associations, for example, commended him for supporting the demand for church disestablishment in Scotland. Parnell appreciated, said East Perthshire, that this was the desire of the majority of Scots; a fact disregarded by the Tories who used their English majority to defeat the measure "regardless of Scotch feeling". East Perthshire also praised his general reformism and, in particular, his part in the abolition of flogging in the Army. They ended their address by observing that Scotland was by now fully in favour of Ireland's demands and " ... it will assuredly hold true, in this as in other matters, that what Scotland says today England will say tomorrow".

The address from "The Working Men of Edinburgh", Scotsmen not Irishmen to judge from the names of the committee, insisted that the Irish people should "rest assured that the great mass of the people of Scotland are with them in their struggle". Two Highland groups spoke of the common interests and fellow-feeling between 2 Celtic nations. Ten of the addresses dwelt at length on how much the land reform movement in Scotland owed to the Irish example. Only 3 of these were Liberal Associations. One of them, from North West Lanarkshire, said:

> As in the times of old, so in our day Ireland is proving herself the land of bright ideas and daring sacrifice. Henry George has well said, "the Irish chips have set the Scottish coal on fire".... Davitt's glorious principles are not only in the Highlands winning the land for the people, but have created a movement for reform through all Scotland that will only terminate with the sweeping away of landlord feudalism, and the restoration to the Scottish people of the Scottish land.

This was radical stuff from a Liberal Association, with its citation of Henry George and Michael Davitt, but North West Lanarkshire did have a very advanced M.P. in R. B. Cunninghame Graham.

The rest of these addresses on the land question were from the Highland Land Law Reform Association, the Sutherlandshire Association, the Scottish Land Restoration League, and similar groups.

> We thank you for what you have done for the peasantry of Ireland, not only because we feel the claims of sympathy and brotherhood, but because in resisting landlord injustice and oppression you have been fighting our battle as well as their.

wrote the Highland Land Law Reform Association. "The Crofters have reaped relief from your sowing, and we tender you their and our sincere thanks" said the Crofters Friends more definitely; while the Edinburgh Branch of the Sutherlandshire Association were even more sure of the role Parnell had played in their struggle: "To you and the Irish agitation, Scotland, and more especially the Highlands, is indebted for the Crofter Commission and the benefits accruing from it ...". Many might have felt that Parnell's assistance to the Crofters was more inspirational and symbolic than concrete, but it was an occasion that justified some exaggeration due to enthusiasm.

The most interesting feature of the whole volume, however, are the remarks on Scottish Home Rule. Eight of the addresses specifically talk of the prospects for Scottish Home Rule following Irish.

> We believe that the granting of self-government to Ireland will initiate the concession of self-government to all, and become the means, in part, of federalising the nations and unifying the peoples of our great realm by a closer and more lasting bond of brotherhood.

Thus the Partick Junior Liberals in the clearest statement of the national demand. The Wick Burgh address repeated the line taken by the Crofters' groups: "It is well-known that in fighting the battle of the people of Ireland for national self-government, you are also fighting the battle of the people of Scotland". Several addresses commended Parnell, even more curiously than in the case of the crofters, for championing the Scottish Home Rule cause along with the Irish. Others merely asserted the Scottish demand: "Scotland stands in urgent need" of Home Rule (Castle Douglas); "The right of self-government, for which Ireland for centuries has struggled, we claim for Scotland and the sister countries ..." (Glasgow Junior Liberals). Somewhat optimistically, the North West Lanarkshire address proclaimed that, thanks to the Irish example, "the heart of Scotland" was now "throbbing with national impulses".

Only one address at all critical of Parnell was presented. This was from an organisation called the Scottish Land Restoration League. The tone of its address was generally friendly, though the warmth in it was directed past Parnell to the Irish people. The leader they held in veneration was,

not surprisingly, Michael Davitt. To them, Parnell's finest hour had been 1880-81, when he was "putting Michael Davitt's glorious doctrine so well forward in (his) political action". After that he had tended to desert truly advanced ideals.

> In later times, induced by your party politics and the idea of obtaining Home Rule from one or other of the two great parties that hitherto have controlled this Empire, you gave our 'Social Reform' some serious and most ungrateful blows. We hold that was an error even in your party politics. It was the Democracy that compelled the Liberal party to take a wise relation towards Ireland. It is the Democracy that will compel the full measure of your just demand. But we are aware this will not be so apparent to you as it would be to a more democratic leader; therefore we have no fault to find with those acts of yours which were injurious to Scottish Land Restoration and to Scottish Home Rule. As men of principle we help all reformers, whether they help us or no. Therefore we present to you the warmest wishes for your success ....

As it is sometimes hard to see exactly what Parnell was alleged to have done for Scottish Home Rule, so it is equally hard to see what he did to impede it. Perhaps the rebuke stemmed from the Land Restoration League's Vice-President John Ferguson, the friend of Davitt and erstwhile supporter of a younger and, as he saw it, more radical Parnell.

Eight resolutions mentioning the prospects for Scottish Home Rule may not seem very many, but they were obviously from the Liberal associations who were in the ascendant in the party. For in the autumn of the same year the annual conference of the whole Scottish Liberal Party passed the following resolution:

> That this National Conference, is of the opinion that Home Rule should be granted to Scotland, so that the Scotch people may have the sole control and management of their own National affairs, and deems the true solution of the Home Rule question to be in the direction of granting Legislatures to Scotland, England,

> Ireland and Wales, but in respect of the urgency of the claim of Ireland, regards that country as requiring first and immediate consideration (24).

This resolution originated in an approach to the Eastern Committee of the Scottish Liberal Association by Waddie and Mitchell of the S.H.R.A., in which they asked to meet the committee with a view to forming some sort of alliance. The committee declined, but drafted the resolution which was passed at the conference. A clear difference of approach was emerging between the S.L.A. and the activists of the S.H.R.A. The latter body was pressing for simultaneous Home Rule all round, while the S.L.A. was declaring for Scottish Home Rule after Irish, taking up a middle course between the S.H.R.A. and Gladstone, who was not prepared to admit the automatic extension of Home Rule to Scotland. Thus when 2 S.H.R.A. members introduced a resolution calling just for Scottish Home Rule and making no mention of Ireland at all to the Scottish Liberals' General Council in February 1890, it was rejected "by a large majority" (25).

In the same month as this General Council meeting, Scottish Home Rule came up again in Parliament. Clark was again the proposer, wishing to add as an amendment to the Queen's Speech:

> That it is desirable, while retaining the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament, to devolve upon a legislature in Scotland the consideration of the domestic affairs of that country.

As it had been the year before, the main thrust of his speech was that Scotland's wishes were neglected through overcrowding of parliamentary business, and thwarted by the weight of

English votes. He again stressed his loyalty to the Union and the Empire, both of which would be strengthened by devolution. He suggested a simple form of Home Rule, to be granted first to Ireland, then to Scotland, and lastly to Wales.

He was seconded by J. Seymour Keay (Gladstonian Liberal Elgin and Nairn). Keay said that it was wrong of the Unionists to laugh at the idea of Scottish Home Rule: they should grant it now while Scotland was still relatively contented and before another Ireland developed. Six more members spoke, all in opposition to the amendment. One backbench Tory dismissed the idea as ridiculous, as did the Lord Advocate, J. P. B. Robertson, for the government: "This would be a step backwards, if possible, towards the darkness from which the country was withdrawn by the Union". Gladstone again spoke at length, on the same theme as his declaration the previous year. To put through Home Rule all round would just be too difficult:

> The only practical way of illustrating it is that which was employed by Mr. Bright when he said it was like driving six omnibuses abreast down Park Lane.

There was some little comfort for the Scottish Home Rulers: "But I am bound to say that this question is ripening in Scotland, though it is not ripe". Indeed, he had the "distinct conviction" that the question would come up for really serious discussion "in due time".

Edward Marjoribanks (Berwickshire), the Scottish Liberal Whip, was definitely opposed to the resolution, and accused Clark

of making himself out to be more moderate than he was:

> My hon. Friend was President of a Scotch Home Rule Association, which has sent members all over Scotland to say that Scotch Home Rule ought to take precedence of or to pari passu with Irish Home Rule.

Marjoribanks had picked up on the divergence of opinion between the S.L.A. and the S.H.R.A., which was a problem for the M.P.s who were members of both organisations. Marjoribanks was unusual in being so set against Scottish Home Rule, even as right-wing a Liberal as Ronald Munro Ferguson (Leith) telling the House that it was clear that there was strong grass-roots support for Home Rule throughout Scotland, though there was also "a firm determination that her claims should not embarrass the policy of the right hon. gentleman the member for Mid Lothian towards Ireland".

Marjoribanks finished his speech with an extraordinary expression of Scottish patriotism:

> I may also say that whether we agree with the right hon. gentleman or not, we are at any rate proud of the fact that at this moment one of the chief ministers who sit upon the Treasury bench, I allude to the Chief Secretary for Ireland, is a Scotchman.

This was a stab at Clark and his allies. Trying as they were to establish Scotland's credentials in the fight for Celtic Home Rule, they would not wish to be reminded that "Bloody Balfour" was a Scotsman.

When the House divided, the amendment to the Queen's Speech was lost by 181 votes to 141. The resolution for Scottish Home Rule had again been lost, though by a significantly smaller margin than the year before (26). For the rest of 1890 the S.L.A. left aside thoughts of Scottish Home Rule and

concentrated on Irish problems. During May they agreed to oppose Balfour's Land Purchase Bill "vigorously", as it was "not fitted fairly and equitably to settle the agrarian question" and, more importantly because it was "opposed by the people of Ireland speaking through the voice of their representatives in Parliament". This was a politically sound but slightly ironic reason for opposing the Bill as, during the bitterness of the next year, Parnell was to claim that he rejected the Bill at the request of the Liberal leadership. At any rate, the S.L.A. seems to have realised that opposition to the Bill was a little half-hearted: when Seymour Keay, the M.P. who had seconded the Home Rule amendment, offered them a pamphlet he had written on the subject, the association's Literature Committee "declined for the present" (27). Instead, they contented themselves with reprinting a generalised attack on landlordism: a speech by the President of the Partick Liberal Association on "The Landlord and Home Rule Questions":

> The treatment which the Highland crofters have received at the hands of their landlords is so similar in character, to that of the Irish tenants, as to show that the spirit of landlordism is about as exacting in Scotland as it is, or has been, in Ireland (28).

At the end of November, the Executive of the S.L.A. held a meeting specially called to discuss the crisis over Parnell's leadership. A resolution was passed, expressing the Association's:

> unqualified approval of the position taken up by Mr. Gladstone at this juncture on behalf of the Liberal Party. Further it condemns the manifesto issued by Mr. Parnell as entirely ignoring the cause of the present crisis, and as harmful to the cause of Home Rule for Ireland (29).

The resolution was circulated to Gladstone and John Morley, his partner in the negotiations with Parnell and the Irish Party, as well as Harcourt and Marjoribanks. On the Irish side, they sent copies to Parnell himself, to show him that however radical they were, and however popular he had become in Scotland, and especially Edinburgh, they would be following Gladstone. It was also sent to Justin McCarthy, Sexton, Tim Healy and Michael Davitt.

The resolution was passed on November 29. The speed with which the Executive acted shows the importance they must have placed on the issue. For Gladstone's letter to John Morley, in which he stated that if Parnell remained it "would render my retention of the leadership of the Liberal Party, based as it has been mainly upon the presentation of the Irish cause, almost a nullity", had been published in the press only on November 26. Further, Parnell's manifesto, which they referred to, had appeared in the Dublin Freeman's Journal that day, the 29th. The Scottish Liberal minutes do not record the composition of the Executive, but it seems likely that if they did not have some M.P. very close to events among their members, they were in touch with one. Their list of Irish leaders who were to receive their resolution also shows an intelligent knowledge of the Irish Parliamentary Party. The only surprise might have been Davitt, who was not an M.P. at this time, but he was felt to have strong links with Scotland, and he was also the only Irish leader to have spoken out against Parnell at this stage.

The 1891 annual conference of the S.L.A. again rejected a S.H.R.A. resolution on Scottish Home Rule, the conference adding that it was unnecessary to discuss the question at all since they had passed a clear declaration of their view in 1889 (30). The party managers were obviously trying to avoid extended discussion of the question of Home Rule priority. Clark and Hunter, however, had already moved from the official Liberal stance to the S.H.R.A. one, perhaps prompted by the current disarray of the Irish Party, now splitting into Parnellites and Anti-Parnellites.

For, when Clark introduced another call for Scottish Home Rule at Westminster a fortnight later, his resolution demanded full federalism:

> It is desirable to devolve upon the representatives of England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales respectively the management and control of their domestic affairs.

He continued:

> We are told that Scotland ought not to stand in the way; that we ought to do all we can to get the Bill passed for Ireland granting Irish Home Rule; and that then it will be far easier, for the first step will be taken, to give Home Rule to Scotland. But I think it would be much easier to give Home Rule all round than to proceed by different Bills for one fraction after another.

He argued that there was no reason for the Irish to be unhappy about general Home Rule; it would give them as much freedom as a Bill for Ireland alone. Once again he stressed pragmatism not national sentiment.

> How supremely ridiculous it is that this Imperial Parliament should have to decide whether Belfast shall have a main drain, or a monument shall be erected in a certain street in Dublin, or Edinburgh shall have an hotel at the railway station, or Glasgow shall have a dock!

This was true federalism in another way too, for the seconder was a Welsh member, S. T. Evans (Gladstonian Liberal Mid Glamorgan). The union of Celtic hearts, however, was not complete: Evans spent his speech outlining Welsh grievances, which he said Clark had either failed to understand or to express. J. Somervell (Conservative Ayr District) had just risen to oppose when the Bill failed anyway, the House being counted and containing less than 40 members (31). The English had illustrated Clark's contention of lack of interest by staying away; as, it should be said, a good number of the Scots and Welsh must have done.

The Home Rulers were back again the next year. In February 1892, a Government of Scotland Bill, "on the motion of Mr. Hunter", received a formal first reading (32). Two months later, Hunter introduced the second reading. This Bill represented another new departure for the Scots Home Rulers, a further stage, for it called for Home Rule for Scotland alone without reference to Ireland. In a short speech, Hunter did not go into details, merely stating that his proposal was "almost precisely identical" to the 1886 Irish Bill; in form that is. Hunter was clearly a radical who saw advanced views in Scotland benefiting from Home Rule.

> Under the operation of this Bill, if it becomes law, the Scotch people, without the interference of the English people - and, above all things, without the interference of the other House - would be able to pass such measures for the good government of their country as they might feel just and necessary.

As soon as Hunter had proposed the second reading and sat down, the House, as had happened the year before, was counted out: the Bill had failed (33).

Three days later, however, G. B. Clark returned to the attack with another Bill. This was an identical resolution to the one he had advanced in 1891, for Home Rule all round. Clark and Hunter had worked closely together before on Home Rule: Hunter had seconded the first proposal in 1889. Either, therefore, they decided to mount a 2-pronged offensive this year, or they had fallen out over the type of Home Rule to be promoted; Clark opting for bringing Ireland in with Scotland in a general measure, and Hunter brushing Ireland aside and going for Scottish devolution alone. Clark was to get the better debate.

As when he had proposed this measure the year before, Clark was on the offensive, not the defensive, particularly over Ireland.

> So with regard to Scotland; Scotland is demanding (Home Rule), and after a dissolution, and Parliament meets again, there will be a larger number of members in proportion from Scotland for Home Rule than you have now from Ireland for Home Rule for Ireland.
>
> I am not going to raise the question of what you should give to Ireland. I do not speak for Ireland. But what you give to Ireland we shall claim for Scotland, and anything less we will not have.

He was seconded by Sir John Leng (Gladstonian Liberal Dundee), an S.H.R.A. Vice-President. Leng was the proprietor of the Dundee Advertiser, which newspaper had, presumably through his offices, declared strongly for Scottish Home Rule in a long editorial published on November 26 1889. He said he had been elected as a Home Ruler, remained "a sensible Home Ruler" and attacked the inconsistency "of those who think that while Home Rule would be good as physic for Ireland, it would be

poison for Wales and Scotland"; this was surely a ridiculous argument. For the first time in one of these debates, there were contributions from Irish members. P. Dunbar Barton (Conservative Mid Armagh) announced briskly that Ulster was against all or any Home Rule. The other Irish speaker was Colonel J. P. Nolan (Parnellite Galway County North), a leading and ultra-loyal Parnellite. He said that he hoped the Scots would decide to keep the claim of Ireland pre-eminent, and that Irish nationalists were not keen on the idea of federalism at this stage. For he did not believe that the call for Home Rule in Scotland was as old or as strong as it was in Ireland. He had to admit, however, that the Irish example was having effect:

> I have no right to speak from what I know of the Scotch people; but certainly from what I know of the Scotch members - having been for 20 years in the House - I must say that every year a larger and larger number of Scotch members seem to be anxious that some sort of Home Rule should be established for Scotland.

Mark J. Stewart (Conservative Kirkcudbright) said that Scotland was happy with present arrangements; these proposals were put forward by a few "agitators". If Scottish business was neglected sometimes, he remarked with more aplomb than accuracy, it was because the House spent too much time discussing Irish Home Rule. Official condemnation came from the President of the Local Government Board, C. T. Ritchie. He observed that the debate was very poorly attended: if the English members were to decide the resolution's fate that was because the other nationalities were hardly represented.

> Judging from the fact that there is not a single member from Ireland on the opposite benches; that there are

> very few from Scotland, and only two from Wales, I think there is pretty good evidence of the fact that a demand for Home Rule does not find expression in this House.

This undeniable lack of attendance was a problem for the Scottish Home Rulers. They were victims of the fact that no-one seriously expected their proposals to succeed, or if they did to get any further parliamentary time. In a busy schedule they therefore treated them as debates which could safely be missed. There is, of course, only Ritchie's word for it that there were "very few" Scottish members present. At any rate, when the vote was taken 128 members attended the division, and they voted against 74 to 54 (34).

In July 1892 the Liberals returned to power in a general election. Gladstone, now over 80, was still their leader, and made it clear that he was determined to introduce another Irish Home Rule Bill. This he did on February 13 1893. Parliament spent a considerable amount of 6½ months discussing the Home Rule Bill, including the summer months when the House was not usually in session. The Bill passed its third reading on the night of September 1/2. A week later, September 8, it was overwhelmingly defeated in the House of Lords.

The S.L.A. annual conference of 1893 made no mention of Scottish Home Rule though, as we shall see, it was not entirely forgotten in the excitement of the Irish Bill. The conference did however discuss the Irish Bill, and passed the following resolution:

> That this conference hails with satisfaction the introduction of the Home Rule Bill, believes it to contain a needful, safe and sufficient plan to give self government to Ireland without endangering the unity of the Empire, and trusts that when its details are adequately discussed and adjusted, it may pass into law, and so bring about a settlement of the question alike honourable to Great Britain, and conducive to the peace and prosperity of Ireland (35).

Many Scottish members, of course, contributed to the immensely long debates on the Irish Bill, a good number speaking on more than one occasion. Sir J. Rigby (Forfarshire), the Solicitor General, for instance, led for the government during several weeks of the Committee stage. The Scottish M.P.s naturally tended to speak and vote on party lines, as did the other members of the Commons. Only references to how the Bill might affect Scotland will be discussed here.

Three Scottish Liberals said that they hoped and believed that the Bill was but the first step to a federal solution (36). Only Dr. D. MacGregor (Inverness-shire) dared to attack the leader on his most sacred ground directly, by criticising the decision to advance Irish Home Rule alone:

> He much regretted that the Prime Minister, after the long consideration he had given to the question, had not seen his way to the introduction of a Bill dealing concurrently with Scotland, Wales and Ireland. If Home Rule were a good thing for Ireland, why was it not a good thing for Scotland?

Even he, however, was later overwhelmed by the excitement of the imminent passing of the third reading:

> His verdict was that Home Rule was now inevitable, not only for Ireland, but on federal lines. It would be just as easy to sweep back the Atlantic with the proverbial broom as it would be to stop the tide that was now steadily flowing on to government by the people for the people (37).

Dr. Hunter spoke in Committee on the clause to give Ireland a second chamber. He did not actually tackle the question being debated at all, but made again his point that the Scots would not want any equivalent of the House of Lords for themselves:

> He would say frankly that if it were proposed in a Home Rule Bill for Scotland to introduce a Legislative Council such as was proposed in the present Bill, he would rather have no Home Rule at all for Scotland than have it with such a clause. It would meet with the most strenuous opposition. But he must not forget that the circumstances of Ireland and Scotland were not identical (38).

The question of whether Irish M.P.s should be retained at Westminster after Home Rule also interested some Scottish members. The 1886 Bill had proposed excluding them, but Gladstone had since changed his mind, though he did suggest reducing their numbers. This was one of the most controversial clauses of a controversial Bill, and much time was spent on it. Campbell-Bannerman was the first to view it in Scottish terms, as early as the first reading:

> Speaking as a Scotchman, I must say that if there were any similar proposal at any time for Scotland, I should object to having my country excluded from its full representation in the management of Imperial affairs (39).

Most Unionists opposed the clause, arguing that since the rest of Great Britain was to have no voice in the management of Irish affairs, the Irish should have no voice in the affairs of England, Scotland and Wales (40). Sir M. J. Stewart, the Conservative who we have seen as a vigorous opponent of Scottish Home Rule, indulged in some Scottish nationalities of his own on the subject, mixed with some anti-Irish prejudice:

> The people of Scotland, he believed, would not have Irishmen to rule over them. Irishmen were not so popular in Scotland as the Prime Minister seemed to think.... He knew the Irishmen swelled the rates and filled the prisons, and he knew how heavily the Scottish people were taxed by the presence of Irishmen in the country. Yet they were to pay heavily for the privilege of the Irish members coming to the House, and having all their own way in Scottish affairs (41).

While most Liberals of course followed Gladstone, some radical members also spoke against the idea. G. B. Clark did so, but the strongest attack from a Scottish M.P. came from Dr. R. Wallace, who announced that he was unable to vote for the third reading over the issue. He said that the Scots would not accept that:

> while not one individual of their 72 members was to have a syllable to say in Irish affairs, which would be all separately transacted by the Irish themselves in Ireland, there were still to be 80 Irish members here who would have exactly one ninth part more control over Scotch affairs than Scotland would have itself.... It would then undoubtedly become the interest of Ireland to oppose Scotch Home Rule because that would be the best way of retaining Scotch matters here in order to enable them more effectively to coerce the Scotch vote on Irish affairs. (The Scottish people) would be of opinion that this was a very unjust and dangerous proposal (42).

It is difficult to see why Wallace objected so strongly. The fact that the Irish would be able to vote on Scottish questions for a period was undeniable; but, if it was undesirable, it was an inevitable part of the road to federalism. The outburst at the end of his speech seems even more curious: as inaccurate as it was paranoiac. Wallace referred to the Bill as "only half Home Rule", but none of the Scottish Home Rulers had ever suggested the abolition or radical restructuring of the Imperial Parliament. We have seen how Clark had moved from step-by-step federalism to

simultaneous Home Rule all round. Presumably this was their objective, and objection to the Bill; but, if so, one wonders why they did not, like Dr. MacGregor, say so.

These references to Scottish Home Rule occupied, of course, only a tiny fraction of the time spent on the Bill. Nonetheless, from the Home Rulers point of view, they represented an advance on 1886, when the subject was only mentioned once in passing. Clark had also decided to continue the campaign by again introducing a resolution in favour of Scottish Home Rule. This he did on June 23rd, following a Committee session of the Irish Bill. With the Irish Bill in everyone's minds, the resolution was discussed very much in Irish terms. Clark declared, as he had before, that Scotland was overtaxed, remarking: "As a matter of fact, the country that Great Britain exploited was not India, or the Colonies, or Ireland, but Scotland".

Clark was seconded by R. T. Reid. Reid, the M.P. for Dumfries, was a successful lawyer. After a brilliant career at Oxford, he had excelled both academically and sportingly, he had read for the Bar, becoming a Q.C. at the early age of 36. Entering Parliament in 1880, he had combined his legal work with a keen radicalism. He was to have a distinguished career as a law officer: Solicitor-General, Attorney-General and Lord Chancellor, 1905-1912. Reid was known as a friend of Ireland: he had advocated Home Rule from the early 1880s, had been a vigorous critic of Balfour's rule there, and had greatly increased both his reputation and his knowledge of

Ireland by acting as counsel for several members of the Irish Party before the Special Commission. As a Scottish radical and a long-standing Home Ruler, he was a natural supporter of Scottish Home Rule. Nonetheless, with his special interest in the Irish question, it was a little surprising to see him explaining to the House that they should grant Home Rule to Scotland because she had none of the obstacles to Home Rule that Ireland had. She had no Ulster problem, no Roman Catholic preponderance threatening to oppress a minority, and no tradition of disloyalty to worry Unionists. The longest speech came from the new Secretary for Scotland Sir George Trevelyan. Trevelyan was interested, sympathetic and vague. He knew that Scotland had real grievances for, he added defensively, though not a Scot, he was a Scottish M.P. (Glasgow Bridgeton). He thought that, perhaps, the answer might lie in a Scottish Grand Committee, an idea he was to pursue, as we shall see.

Pressed by Reid on this, he declined to outline what powers it might have and fell back on repeating Gladstone on the proposals for extending Home Rule. The principle between Ireland and Scotland remained the same.

> That cannot be construed into an undertaking immediately, at once, and irrespective of the great task which daily and nightly we have before us, and the tremendous difficulties under which it is being carried on, to take Scottish self-government in hand; but it is a pledge that the movement for Irish self-government shall not close the way, but shall smooth and pave the way for Scottish self-government, if the Scottish people want it (43).

This was the first time the Scottish Secretary had spoken in the debates on Scottish Home Rule. Trevelyan did have a

proposal that he was to introduce the next year. Perhaps it is not unduly cynical to suggest that the desire to keep the Scottish Liberals up to the mark on the Irish Bill led to a more serious government interest. Sir Charles Pearson (Conservative Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities) had no doubt that the Scottish Home Rulers were doing the government a service. They were almost achieving the impossible: making Irish Home Rule and Rulers look respectable. With Home Rule in the air, the motion was passed by 168 votes to 150 (44). Though no Bill was proceeded with, it was the first time the Scottish Home Rulers had got a majority for their views.

Trevelyan produced his plan in April of the next year. He introduced a Bill to establish a Scottish Grand Committee to look at all Scottish legislation; the Committee to consist of all the Scottish members and 15 other M.P.s. In his speech he did not mention Home Rule at all. Instead, he dwelt at length on parliamentary overcrowding and referred to his Bill as "a purely practical measure". He closed by saying that he believed it to be also a non-partisan measure.

He was rapidly disabused, no less a figure than Balfour speaking directly after him and expressing complete opposition. Balfour saw the proposal as unsound in practical terms and constitutionally revolutionary. Scottish Liberal Home Rulers gave the Bill a general, if not ecstatic, welcome. Other Unionist members dismissed it as half way to Home Rule; while several of them assured the House that Scottish Liberals were in truth against the proposal as likely to

defuse the need for Home Rule. What they seem to have latched onto was the opposition of the S.H.R.A. who had circularised M.P.s and written a strong attack to The Times:

> The Government either believe in Home Rule or they do not. If they do not believe in it they are playing a hypocritical base part. If they do believe in it they are playing a mean, base, cowardly part (45).

This fierce denunciation was an embarrassment to the Liberal M.P.s who were prepared to take anything they could get. That they did not accept it instead of Home Rule became obvious when J. H. Dalziel introduced another Scottish Home Rule Bill, while Trevelyan's Bill was going through its Committee stage. Dalziel said that the government's Bill did not make Home Rule unnecessary, though it would do as "A temporary makeshift". Trevelyan spoke in this debate too. He said that he would personally support both Bills, though the government would only promote the Grand Committee proposal. This immediately brought Balfour to his feet. The 2 schemes, he argued, were incompatible, that much was obvious to any rational mind. Trevelyan, having introduced one, now said that he would support the second before the fate of the first was decided: his performance was "a comedy". Nonetheless, the Bill received a first reading by 180 votes to 170; without government backing, it then lapsed (46).

After further debate covering 5 days, Trevelyan's Bill, however, was passed despite the opposition making much of the confusion in Scottish affairs caused by the 2 Bills. Unionists succeeded in drastically reducing it by making it

operative for one parliamentary session only (47). By the next year the Liberal government was collapsing and they did not try to reintroduce it.

The Scottish Home Rulers, on the other hand, were back again in 1895, this time proposing full federalism. Dalziel was again the proposer, with David Lloyd George seconding. The third speaker in the debate was the leader of the Parnellite Irish nationalists, John Redmond. Redmond was strongly opposed to a federal Bill: it was entirely wrong to put Ireland "on precisely the same level" as England, Scotland and Wales, where there was no real need or demand for Home Rule. "Even the hon. Member (i.e. Dalziel) would not stand up in the House and say that the demand for Scotch Home Rule was an urgent and pressing question at the moment". The debate was only "the merest academic discussion of an abstract theory". The 1893 Irish Bill had represented the correct approach: to give Home Rule to Ireland alone, but in a form that could later be extended if required.

Redmond's speech was attacked by John Dillon, one of the leaders of the main Irish nationalist party. Indeed Dillon never mentioned Scotland when he spoke, concentrating on criticising Redmond for ingratitude. The men putting forward this motion were loyal friends and supporters of Irish nationalism, consequently it behoved Irish nationalists to support them when they sought something for themselves. Redmond's view was "the policy of political idiocym and those who advocated it should betake themselves to the hillsides of

Ireland, and not sit upon the benches of the House of Commons". Dillon, however, was no true convert to Scottish Home Rule. When the proposal next came before the House, he was, as we shall see, to take a very similar line to Redmond's. What was going on here was infighting between the different sections of the Irish; it was a desire to belabour Redmond that prompted Dillon to speak, not an interest in Scottish affairs.

Trevelyan again made a long speech, explaining that he would vote for the Bill, but that its promoters must not expect the government, who were already very busy, to do anything about it. In fact, as already mentioned, the government was not so much busy as disintegrating. Gladstone had retired after the defeat of the Irish Bill, and the party had decided to continue rather than call an election. Lord Rosebery was now Prime Minister, with Sir William Harcourt leading in the Commons. But the government was divided: Rosebery was ineffective, and he and Harcourt disliked each other to the point that it was difficult for any policy to be formulated. They were to be defeated in a couple of months, to Rosebery's relief, and to lose an election in July.

As before, Trevelyan's intervention in the debate immediately brought Balfour to his feet. He said he hoped that the government would take up the Bill: nothing could better demonstrate than this idea for 5 parliaments and 5 executives, that Home Rule was "ridiculous". However, the opposition did not even force a division, the motion was quietly agreed to and quietly disappeared (48).

The motion did not come up again for 3 years. Presumably, with a strong Unionist government and the Liberals still in disarray, the Scottish Home Rulers considered the time too unauspicious. It was introduced in March 1898 by a Welsh member, J. Herbert Roberts and seconded by R. T. Reid. It called for Home Rule all round. Like other Bills before it, it soon got enmeshed in the problem of Irish priority, R. B. Haldane opposing it on these grounds. Two other Liberals proposed an amendment to put Ireland first.

John Dillon spoke again, and said he would give qualified approval only if this amendment stood. Ireland deserved priority:

> I ask the Scotch and Welsh members, when did they think of asking for Home Rule? Not until on the floor of this House - not to speak of the previous movements in Ireland - year after year the Irish party had fought and struggled for the cause.

John Redmond's brother was more scathing: he referred to it as "a breach of faith" for Liberals to propose a federal scheme; he knew nothing about Scotland or Wales, and considered them, in the Home Rule context, an irrelevance:

> I say that, as far as I am concerned, it is not a matter of moment to me what the opinion of Welshmen or Scotchmen is on this matter. I am sent to this House to try and get Home Rule for the people I represent in Ireland. That is my object, and my object all the time as long as I am in this House, and it is no part of my business to ask the English people to break up their system, which has prevailed successfully for them as far as I know, and to establish in Wales and Scotland fresh legislative assemblies.

It must have been galling indeed for the Welsh and Scottish supporters to be told that they were part of an English system "which has prevailed successfully" by an Irish

nationalist they looked upon as an ally. They were at least on familiar ground being told by Balfour, now government leader in the Commons, that: "We object to Home Rule, whether it begins with Ireland and ends with Wales, or begins with Wales and ends with Ireland".

It was indeed a lacklustre debate, the House being counted out as there were less than 40 members present (49). By the end of the 1890s the Scottish Home Rulers were losing momentum and losing heart. The Liberal party, their main indeed only hope, was still in disarray, divided and unpopular. It was to make a poor showing in the 1900 Khaki Election, the Conservatives successfully accusing them of disloyalty in time of war. Bad years for the Liberals meant bad years for Home Rule generally. Irish Home Rule was ignored by the Unionist government, and was slipping down the list of Liberal priorities; inevitably it took Scottish Home Rule with it.

What then, if anything, had the Scottish Home Rulers achieved by 1900? On the surface, quite a lot. They had staged 8 debates, some quite vigorous and well-attended, securing a majority on 2 occasions. If the Unionists had opposed them, that was only to be expected; it was more encouraging that their own leadership had seemed to bless their proposal. They had succeeded in giving the impression in parliament that advanced Scottish Liberals, the men of the future, favoured Scottish Home Rule. Outside parliament, they had brought the Scottish Liberal Party along with them,

getting resolutions for Scottish Home Rule on 3 occasions. In this respect, 1898 represented an advance, the resolution calling for Home Rule ending:

> it is further of opinion that it is desirable that all Liberal candidates for Scottish seats at the next General Election should pledge themselves to support such a measure (50).

Not all the credit went, of course, to the Scottish Liberals. The S.H.R.A. had worked hard: publishing, lobbying M.P.s and harrying the Liberals. If they had had strained relations with the Liberals, they had also had some surprising, and gratifying support. The North British Daily Mail, for example, though generally Liberal Unionist, had suggested to Rosebery in 1895 that he should consider granting Scottish and Welsh Home Rule, without bothering about Ireland at all. The Irish, the paper unkindly remarked, were presently more interested in pursuing their own faction fighting than in pressing their claims (51).

On any deeper level, however, it is hard to judge the Home Rulers as succeeding by 1900. Their impact on public opinion, by their own admission had been slight. The S.H.R.A. was rapidly fading, and little more is heard of it after the 1890s. Its last approach to the S.L.P. was in 1895, when it was again rebuffed. The foundation of a nationalist pressure group within the S.L.P., and the death of J. S. Blackie speeded up its collapse, though some of its leading members were to re-emerge after 1900.

Even the Home Rulers' successes in parliament lose impact on closer scrutiny. It was not an indication of strength, but

of real weakness, when the Unionists had allowed the 1895 resolution to be approved without a division. It could be argued that the leading Tory, A. J. Balfour, took them seriously: after all he spoke 6 times in the Home Rule debates. If one looks at Balfour's speeches, however, one can see that it was Home Rule for Ireland that he was attacking. He believed the idea of Scottish Home Rule to be so ridiculous that it could be used to discredit the whole concept of Home Rule. It was the battle over Ireland he was fighting all the time, and he thought the Scottish Home Rulers made good weapons in that battle.

The blessings of the Liberal leaders turned out, too, to be very qualified. From 1886 to 1893 Gladstone's only interest lay in promoting Irish Home Rule, and everything else had to be sacrificed to that. While some of his senior colleagues had their doubts, though they did not dare express them, those doubts envisaged less Home Rule not more. After 1893 Gladstone's declaration on the order of Home Rule priorities stood, with the added discouragement that many front bench Liberals now had little heart for Home Rule at all. An exception was Trevelyan, but he took the Chiltern Hundreds and resigned from parliament in 1897.

The Home Rulers' position, therefore, did not look encouraging. Inspired but derided and opposed by the Irish, ignored by their own leaders, and despised by the Unionists, they seemed to be just going through the motions with their annual debate. However, the years of Unionist rule, from

1895 to 1906, did not destroy the hope of Scottish Home Rule. We shall see a Home Rule movement that had in fact grown stronger re-emerge.

CHAPTER 3: SCOTTISH HOME RULE 1900-1914

> And again, when he was talking about Home Rule, and saying that we wanted it not only for Ireland, but for Wales and Scotland also, 'And for hell too!' ejaculated a would-be humourist. 'Certainly, my friend' was the reply; 'I always like to hear a man stand up for his own country'.
>
> Robert Farquaharson, Liberal M.P. for West Aberdeenshire, recounting an anecdote about Lloyd George.

The Liberal party in 1900 was in considerable disarray. It was now led by a Scot, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman. Campbell-Bannerman, however, presided over a divided party, many of whom hardly recognised his authority. The Liberal Imperialists, the right wing, wished to back the Conservative government over the Boer War. The Pro-Boers, the left, wished to oppose the war. Campbell-Bannerman stood somewhere in the middle, inclining towards the Pro-Boers. The government, happy to exploit Liberal confusion and war patriotism called, and won, a general election in October 1900. In Scotland, the Unionists increased their representation considerably, winning a majority of Scottish seats for the only time between 1880 and 1914.

With the Unionists so much in the ascendant, neither in parliament, nor in the S.L.P., were Irish or Scottish Home Rule discussed until 1906. By then, the positions of the parties were reversed. The Unionists were now divided over Tariff reform. Since the emergence of Tariff reform as an issue in 1903 a change of government had been widely predicted. No-one, however, was prepared for the enormous Liberal majority that emerged when a general election finally

came in 1906. It was an extraordinary triumph for Campbell-Bannerman, after years of difficult opposition leadership, when many of his senior colleagues had treated him with a contempt that equalled, and sometimes exceeded, that of the Unionists.

If the years 1900 to 1906 were unrewarding years for Scottish Home Rule, they were not totally barren. They saw the appearance of 3 Scottish nationalist periodicals, and the foundation of the Young Scots Society. The Y.S.S. was a radical group inside the Scottish Liberal Party, established immediately after the general election defeat. Initially, it concentrated on the Boer War, presenting the case against the war, and upholding the right of free speech to present that case. When the war ended, it turned its main propaganda effort to Home Rule, promoting Home Rule all round and the need for Scottish Home Rule to be introduced with Irish. There was obviously Irish influence in the choice of name: Young Ireland had been a movement of the 1840s.

The Young Scots Society published its general programme as:

> To stir interest in progressive politics, to encourage the study of history, social and industrial science, to promote Liberal principles; to further the interests of Scotland and to secure for Scotland the right of self-government (1).

The President of the Y.S.S. was Thomas Shaw. Shaw was a lawyer, the M.P. for Hawick since 1892, and had been Scottish Solicitor General from 1894 to 1895. He was to defeat Arthur Conan Doyle in the election of 1906, and to

leave the Commons to become a law lord in 1909. The General Secretary and Treasurer was John Gulland, an Edinburgh corn merchant. He had been on the Edinburgh United Liberal Committee that had welcomed Parnell in 1889, was to serve on Edinburgh Town Council 1904-06, and then be elected for Dumfries as the successor to R. T. Reid when he became Lord Chancellor. The Y.S.S.' publications department was run by J. M. Hogge. He was also from Edinburgh and had been President of the Students Representative Council while at the University. He was also to enter parliament, for Edinburgh East, in a by-election in 1912.

The Y.S.S. was important in reviving radical politics in Scotland during a lean time for the Liberals. Both Roland Muirhead, Honorary President of the Scottish National Party in the 1930s, and the Rev. James Barr, Labour M.P. and Scottish nationalist during the 1920s began their political careers inside it (2). Hogge's publications department had 5 pamphlets available by 1902. None of them dealt directly with Home Rule though 2 by Shaw touched on the subject: "Patriotism and Empire" and "Gladstone: a Living Teacher". The Y.S.S. clearly believed that their members were interested in Ireland, for they arranged with the publishers to distribute A Hundred Years of Irish History by Richard Barry O'Brien, Parnell's biographer. Hogge described the book in a letter to the Selkirk Y.S.S. branch as "absolutely the best thing I know" (3).

The Y.S.S. grew quickly. Hogge wrote in the same letter (1902): "We have 10 new branches in active formation - a

proof that our little movement is catching on". By the next year there were 25 branches, including 2 outside Scotland, in London and Liverpool, and 1620 members (4).

Of a very different stamp to the radicals of the Y.S.S. was Theodore Napier, who founded his nationalist quarterly The Fiery Cross in January 1901. Napier, like Wanliss, was an Australian Scot who came to live in Edinburgh in the 1880s. He had been Assistant Secretary of the S.H.R.A., and a leading pro-Boer. He was the Chairman of the Edinburgh "stop-the-war" Committee and had been beaten up by a mob of jingoistic medical students during an anti-war meeting.

Napier was a very unconventional nationalist, a striking figure always to be seen in highland dress. Compton Mackenzie, who met him when he became interested in Jacobitism in 1899, later described him as "redoubtable" and as "one of the picturesque glories of Princes Street" (5). For Jacobitism was the main platform of the Fiery Cross. It set out 11 demands in its first issue, and the first was the restoration of the Stuarts. After that, came calls for a Scottish parliament, Privy Council and Mint, along with the return of the Stone of Destiny. Napier was certainly not hesitant in his recipe for the revival of Scotland's national life: with the Stuarts, he favoured the restoration of the Clan system "subject to certain limitations". In social terms he was conservative: he accepted votes for all men, though not women, but "we will not, however, support the proposal to grant 'one man one vote' but rather that of

a graduated system of voting, according to social position".

He closed his 11 demands with a rousing couplet:

> Woe to the wretch who fails to rear
> At this dread sign the ready spear!

In the sixth issue of the Fiery Cross, April 1902, Napier first turned to the subject of Ireland in an article "Scotland and Ireland, Repeal of the Unions". He showed himself to be sympathetic to Ireland, but determined to press for one measure of full federalism.

> As Scottish nationalists, who ourselves are seeking the restoration of Scotland's lost, surrendered, and stolen rights, we cannot but heartily sympathise with our Irish brothers, who are likewise agitating for their national parliament or, as it is popularly termed, for 'Home Rule'.
>
> Here we express our opinion that the great mistake of Mr. Parnell, Mr. Gladstone, and the Liberal Party was in their advocating first and only Home Rule for Ireland, instead of Repeal of the Unions (1707 and 1801). Had they made a general demand for repeal of both incorporating Unions, with the end in view of the creation of a Federal Union, and local National Parliaments for each of the three or four nationalities, we believe the demand would have logically and practically carried more weight than in asking it for Ireland alone or first. We quite admit that Ireland's case was pressing; but Scotland too has suffered for nearly a century longer than Ireland from a deprivation of its National Parliament; and although present-day Scotsmen are basely false to the rights and honour of their nation, still Scotland's claim for the immediate restoration of its National Parliament is unquestionable.

Following this line, Napier asserted the next year that Gladstone would not have encountered the opposition he did if he had gone for one measure of federalism. It seems a remarkably optimistic and naive argument to hold that Unionist opposition, at this date at least, to Home Rule would have been silenced by a proposal for more Home Rule.

But Napier used it to castigate the Y.S.S. for promoting the slogan "Back to Gladstone" (6).

In October 1903 Napier commented on a speech by John Redmond at the National Welsh dinner held on St. David's day. Redmond had suggested to the Welsh M.P.s that they group themselves as the Irish had done to press for Welsh Home Rule along with Irish. Redmond was now the leader of the re-united Irish Party and was a very different man to the leader of the Parnellite rump appealing to extremism that he had been in the mid-1890s. He was by this time promoting himself as a constitutional patriotic nationalist, and it was in character with this to be blessing the idea of Home Rule all round, though he was still anxious to maintain Ireland's priority. Napier was quite taken with what Redmond said, though his own response bore no relation to practical politics at all. He envisaged 2 essential changes to this valuable notion: the inclusion of Cornwall in a federalist scheme, and the conversion of Irish nationalism to legitimate royalism.

By this time, another nationalist magazine had started. The Scottish Patriot, published in Glasgow, was an offshoot of the Scottish Patriotic Association. It was edited by John Wilson, a Glasgow advertising agent. While lacking Napier's eccentricity, the Patriot was also conservative in tone. Its "Aims and Objects" ran to 9, as opposed to Napier's 11, starting with "The Cultivation of a Spirit of Patriotism". It aimed to encourage the study of Scotland's history, music,

literature and art, and to preserve the national coinage and flag. Home Rule was implicit, but not explicitly demanded, the only concrete political call being for the lessening of the share of taxation that fell on Scotland.

The Patriot was not enthusiastic about Ireland. It attacked Scotland's M.P.s, especially Campbell-Bannerman, for caring for Ireland more than their own country. It resented the Wyndham Land Act for Ireland of 1903, describing it as "liberal and lavish" and writing:

> We have every sympathy for Irish aspirations for liberty, but there may be too much even of a good thing, and if millions are to be thrown away on Ireland in freeing the land, we do not see why some of the crumbs should not fall to the Highland crofters who are more deserving and just as much in need of help as the Irish tenant.

The Patriot disliked the Irish for bringing the concept of nationalism into disrepute: "For the evil savour thereby attached to nationalism, we have to thank the absurd vapourings of the Irish and Irish Americans" (7).

If the Patriot was cross about Ireland, it was frequently cross about most subjects. It relentlessly attacked Scotland's M.P.s and exhibited a depressing and humourless earnestness. It was cross with someone who made fun of the Kailyard school, it was cross with Richard Lodge, Professor of History at Edinburgh University, for delivering a paper entitled "Is there a Scottish Nation?". It was bitter in indulging in some anti-semitism in an article "The Jew: A Destructive Element in National Life" (8).

One of the last articles the Patriot published before closing down, in 1906, was on Shaw's Mrs. Warren's Profession. Under the heading "Educated Brutality", the article praised the decision to close the play for indecency after one night. The Patriot feared, however, that the episode would only enhance the reputation of this "writer of indecent books and plays". For "there is not sufficient moral backbone in London society to give this man the outside of the door as he deserves" (9).

A more pleasant addition to the nationalist press was The Scottish Nationalist, a monthly edited by the inexhaustable Charles Waddie. It however did not survive its first year. In the introduction to the first issue Waddie dedicated the magazine to Home Rule all round, ending:

> We must convince the English Liberal Party that Scotland declines to be made a tool of any longer, and the only way they can be convinced is for the members from Scotland to form themselves into a National Party with a regular leader and form a close alliance with the Irish ... National Party in the House. That will secure our rights - nothing short of this will have any effect.

Waddie, like Napier, picked up Redmond's speech at the Welsh dinner. He commented favourably on it, as it fitted well into this idea of a Scottish party. Waddie wrote wistfully: "If only the Celtic countries ... would join forces for their common good to preserve national Celtic ideals, ... what enormous benefits could be gained for the prosperity, freedom and happiness of these peoples" (10). Like Napier, Waddie was pleased to see the Irish leader take any interest in the other Celtic nations, but he had too much experience as a

nationalist campaigner to expect much in the way of practical results.

The same number of the Scottish Nationalist contained an article by Agnes Marchbank: "A Scottish Revival in Literature, Art and Music". It was in fact an appeal for a revival, "Wales and Ireland are awake, Scotland sleeps". She was much encouraged by the signs of revival in Ireland, seeing cultural renaissance as a unifying force. Her position may have been overly optimistic, but it was at least interested and informed.

> An Irish revival in literature, music and art has now come to Ireland. Irishmen are finding out that they have a history, a literature and a language. We are all a little sceptical about Ireland. Too little inclined to take the nation as a whole, as a people really in earnest. We fancy that the Orange and the Green will always snarl at each other like two dogs over a bone. We forget that if there are things in which the two parties differ, there are many things in which they are one. Politics come and go and divide chief friends all over the world. The Green and the Orange will have a friendly fight to the end of time. But after all, the life of a nation is not its politics, it is its nationalism in speech, literature, music, art and all else that goes to make up the individual character of the nation. The new Irish revival will raise Ireland to be a great and a glorious nation. It is a bloodless revolution. It is the revival of the national life.

We have seen that the Patriot disliked the Irish Land Act of 1903; the Nationalist also resented it. This measure greatly increased the acquisition of their land by tenants. It was successful, as previous acts had not been, mostly because the incentives to landlords to sell were generous. Some nationalists in Ireland, notably Davitt and Dillon, felt that the terms given to the landlords were too high and that they did not deserve to be bought out so handsomely. But the Bill

was generally seen in Ireland as a good opportunity to settle the land question, and welcomed.

There was no such attraction in it for Scottish nationalists. The Patriot suggested that if the scheme was to be introduced it could have been extended to the Highlands. The Nationalist merely protested that part of the cost would fall on Scotland. Waddie observed that 12 million pounds had been set aside to buy out the landlords:

> As Scotland has to bear her share of these twelve millions, we enter our solemn protest against such iniquity. The reason assigned for this monstrous proposal is that it is needed to bring peace between two classes of Irishmen, the tenants and the landlords, and to atone for the wrongs inflicted by England upon Ireland during seven hundred years of English domination. But Scotland, during these seven centuries, inflicted no wrong upon Ireland, on the contrary, she has, many times, given Ireland her sympathy and material help.... Now why should the Scottish people be taxed to bribe the English garrison to do justice to their tenants? If England has wronged Ireland, let England pay the penalty.... Let Dublin Castle, with all its trumpery grandeur, be swept away, and the money saved applied for the good of the Irish people (11).

The Wyndham Act was one of the last major achievements of a Unionist administration which was beginning to run out of momentum. By 1905 it was becoming clear that Balfour's government could not go on for much longer. He resigned in December, and Campbell-Bannerman immediately took office, calling a general election for the next month. As had been widely predicted he won, but even the most ardent Liberal was unprepared for the immense majority they received. The Unionists fell from 369 to 156 seats, Balfour losing his own seat. The Liberals gained a majority of 88 over all the other parties. With their allies Labour and the Irish

Nationalists voting with them, they had the staggering majority of 358 over the Conservatives and Liberal Unionists. In Scotland, the Unionists held only 12 of the 72 seats.

After 10 years in the wilderness, Liberalism had reached the promised land with a vengeance. The Scottish Patriot was the first to reassert Scotland's claims in an article published even before the general election:

> Scotland and Wales have an equal right to Home Government with Ireland, and if any measure of Local Government is brought in by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, it should certainly be for all divisions of the Empire, and not for Ireland only. Recent events have shown that Home Rule is just as necessary for Scotland as for Ireland, though we do not clamour so much about it (12).

In February 1906, the Y.S.S. through their General Secretary John Gulland called for the Scottish Liberals to form themselves into an unofficial Scottish party to press Scotland's interests. Gulland made the obvious direct comparison with Ireland:

> Thanks to the presence of an Irish Party ... legislation for the 'distressful island' has always been to the fore. A coherent and vigilant Scottish party in the House could work wonders.

He was writing in the Scottish Review and Christian Leader (13), a churchy weekly. He had just been elected for Dumfries District. He was appointed to provide the "Parliamentary Letter" to the Scottish Review; though the magazine was not radical, nor even really interested in party politics, it gave the Y.S.S. a useful platform. In June he was writing of the disproportionate time spent on Irish and Scottish affairs, underlining the message that the Irish received more

parliamentary time because they demanded it. In August he made a definite call for a Scottish Parliament, remarking that the next year would see the 200th anniversary of the Union, an anniversary that would be greeted with little enthusiasm in Scotland (14).

October 1906 saw the annual conference of the S.L.P. call for a Scottish parliament, a call they had not bothered to make since 1899. They also demanded the reconstitution of the Scottish Grand Committee (15). The idea of reviving Trevelyan's committee had been brought up in parliament in April by D. V. Pirie (Aberdeen North). He had put it in the form of a question to the Prime Minister, and Campbell-Bannerman had replied that he could see no objection (16). Pirie was a keen Scottish Home Ruler, listing an interest in devolution in his entry in Dod's Parliamentary Companion. He was not a member of the Y.S.S., perhaps because he had been a serving officer in the Boer War and disliked the Y.S.S.' opposition to the war.

Campbell-Bannerman did revive the Scottish Grand Committee the following year, 1907. This time the Committee was made permanent but was to include 15 non-Scottish members. The S.L.P. welcomed the decision, but again called for a Scottish parliament. They also called for the Committee to be made a sort of unofficial parliament by the removal of the non-Scottish members (17).

Campbell-Bannerman was not set against the idea of Scottish Home Rule though, as with so many other subjects, he could

not be described as an enthusiast. He had written to a friend in 1889: "I am therefore ready (but not anxious for it)", when his views had been sought on the question (18).

1907 saw the appearance of 2 more Scottish nationalist periodicals: Scotia and The Scottish Nation. The latter was put out by the International Scots Home Rule Association, and declared itself anti-imperialist, its policy being "To assert the right of all tribes and nations to self-government". Scotia was the successor to the Scottish Patriot which had closed down the year before and was obsessed with heraldry and the wrongful use of England for Britain.

The Scottish nationalist publicists were a close-knit community. The council of the St. Andrew Society, who put out Scotia, included John Wilson, who had edited the Patriot, Theodore Napier of the Fiery Cross and William Mitchell who had been the Treasurer of the S.H.R.A. (19). An article in the second issue of Scotia on "Are England and Scotland Territorial or Racial Terms?" was by T. D. Wanliss, who we have seen as an author in the 1890s and who was to found his own nationalist magazine the following year. These publicists were hard-working men. Seven Scottish nationalist periodicals were founded between 1900 and 1914. Some lasted less than a year, the Fiery Cross for 11 years. All were run on small budgets and all had small circulations. But they created an impression of greater interest and enthusiasm for Scottish Home Rule than

was perhaps justified. It is possible to over-estimate their power and influence until one sees how it tends to be the same individuals who write for the magazines, publish, lobby the S.L.P., attend conferences and deliver lectures.

In April 1908 the Scottish Review published another in its series of "Parliamentary Letters" by Gulland. In it, he again called for Home Rule all round and publicised a resolution by the Y.S.S. for a Scottish Parliament. It was his last call in that paper, for towards the end of that year it closed down.

In April 1908 Campbell-Bannerman died. As we have seen, he was never a dedicated Scottish Home Ruler, but it is worth looking briefly at his dealings with Ireland. When Trevelyan resigned from the Irish Chief Secretaryship in 1884, Campbell-Bannerman was appointed to the post by Gladstone. It was his first major government post, though he had not been Gladstone's first choice. But after Forster and Trevelyan's unhappy experiences in the job, Gladstone did not find it easy to fill the position. By their own admission, the Irish nationalists did not think much of Campbell-Bannerman and looked forward to harrying him in parliament as they had his predecessors. T. P. O'Connor christened him "the sandbag": it proved a not inappropriate name as the Irish found him both unmovable and imperturbable (20). While his administration, which lasted only 7 months, was unspectacular, Campbell-Bannerman made his name for his sensible and good-humoured handling of the Irish debates in

the Commons. As a contemporary writer in the Spectator put it:

> No taunts worried or annoyed him. If he was asked absurd and insulting questions, he did not, like poor Sir George Trevelyan, flame up about his being 'an English gentleman'. He sat doggedly on, and treated the Irish party like one of the mists of his native land - a tiresome phenomenon, but not one to be overcome by indignation or denunciation. He took the abuse like the attendance at the office, the journeys to Dublin, and the other disagreeable incidents connected with the post, that is, as things to be endured with the minimum of fuss (21).

Campbell-Bannerman left the Irish office unconvinced of the need for Home Rule, but not definitely opposed to the idea: he was one of the first to issue public support when Gladstone converted to the principle. He was not sent back to Ireland during the short administration which brought forward the first Home Rule Bill, but to the War Office, though he did speak several times in the Home Rule debates.

He strongly supported Gladstone's call for Parnell's resignation following the O'Shea divorce case. He did so on the grounds that feeling in Scotland was determinedly anti-Parnell. As he wrote to Harcourt:

> To the best of my observation and information, the feeling among our own people in Scotland is very strong against Parnell remaining as the recognised head of his party. There is here a strong undercurrent of distrust of the Irish character, and this recent exposure strengthens it.

Interestingly, though Campbell-Bannerman himself was to become one of the most dedicated to Home Rule of the Liberal leaders, he never believed that most Scottish Liberals were very keen on helping the Irish. He had written to Lord Spencer in 1885: "I found however that my countrymen have no

interest in the subject (Ireland) beyond a wish to see the disloyal people put down and kept down. There is no love lost between the two countries!" (22).

When the Liberals returned to office in 1892, Gladstone gave Campbell-Bannerman the war office again. He was also put on the committee to draft the second Home Rule Bill. Following the Bill's defeat and Gladstone's retirement, Rosebery, the incoming Prime Minister, kept Campbell-Bannerman on at the war office. It was a snap vote of censure on him over an alleged shortage of cordite that afforded Rosebery the opportunity to resign in 1895.

Campbell-Bannerman gradually emerged as the Liberal leader in the years from 1895 to 1901, though Rosebery remained near the centre of affairs, ready to take up the leadership again at a more opportune moment, and commanding the loyalty of a substantial section of the party. Ireland became one of the main focuses of disagreement between the 2 men, with Rosebery gradually moving over to believing that the Liberals should abandon the commitment to Home Rule.

Campbell-Bannerman maintained his belief in Home Rule, and was eventually to succeed in bringing all Rosebery's lieutenants into his government, leaving Rosebery isolated and alone. When it became clear at the end of 1905 that the Liberals were soon to take office, Campbell-Bannerman invited John Redmond to breakfast with him to discuss Irish policy. He also invited T. P. O'Connor, with whom he had become friendly on a personal level. The meeting was a success.

Campbell-Bannerman started by declaring himself to be as committed as ever to Home Rule as the ultimate goal. But he said that the Liberals could not be expected to introduce a full Home Rule Bill in the next parliament. Such a Bill would have been bound to be as controversial and profligate of parliamentary time as its predecessors, and the Liberals had not had the opportunity to put through any major social legislation since before 1885.

Instead, Campbell-Bannerman expounded a "step by step" policy, in which Home Rule would remain the eventual target, but meanwhile, in Redmond's words "he hoped to be able to pass some serious measure which would be consistent with and would lead up to the other (i.e. Home Rule)" (23). The Irish leaders, realising it was the best they could hope for, accepted with good grace. T. P. O'Connor wrote later:

> Such a declaration was all that the Irish Nationalist Party could have expected at that moment, and it enabled them to give their full support at the elections to the Liberal Party (24).

Cynics were to say, after the election, that Home Rule was not brought forward because the Liberals had such a good majority without the Irish vote. This accord, however, was reached well before the election.

The "step by step" policy was not in fact a success. Campbell-Bannerman was only 2 years in Downing Street before he died. He did produce one devolution scheme, the Irish Councils Bill, in 1907, but the Irish leaders, with the exception of O'Connor, did not like it and it was dropped. It was left to Asquith to take up the Irish question again

in 1911. Nonetheless, the Irish seem to have retained their affection for Campbell-Bannerman. Above all, they respected the fact that his belief in the ideal of Home Rule had never wavered in the wilderness years of 1895 to 1905, when much of the Liberal party wished to drop the idea of Home Rule altogether. Contemporaries recorded the hold over the Commons Campbell-Bannerman exercised in the 2 years of his premiership, when he emerged from being almost a figure of fun to be a considerable leader. He had the affection and respect of the Irish parliamentarians as no British politician had had since Gladstone. O'Connor, who as a friend was not an impartial observer, believed this feeling exceeded that for Gladstone: "The Irish Nationalist had an affection for him, such probably, as he never felt for any Prime Minister before" (25).

On Campbell-Bannerman's death, Asquith became Prime Minister. A month later D. V. Pirie introduced the first reading of a "Bill to amend the provisions for the future government of Scotland". Pirie was the member who had suggested the re-introduction of the Scottish Grand Committee to Campbell-Bannerman. This was the first Scottish Home Rule proposal since 1898. Bringing it in under the 10 minute rule, Pirie spoke briefly of the congestion of Scottish business. The first reading passed 257 votes to 102, the best margin yet achieved for a Scottish Home Rule resolution. A. J. Balfour had spoken against the motion. He admitted that it was unusual to oppose a first reading, but said that he felt it necessary on this occasion. Clearly no form of Home Rule was going to escape his condemnation.

There were 12 sponsors, all reasonably enough from Scottish constituencies. As well as Pirie, they included Gulland, 2 Labour members and 2 Englishmen with Scottish seats: Harcourt and Ponsonby. Robert Harcourt was Sir William's second son. He had succeeded John Morley at Montrose, when Asquith had sent Morley to the Lords in forming his government. Ponsonby was the son of Queen Victoria's private secretary, and had inherited Campbell-Bannerman's constituency of Stirling. Both men had been in parliament for less than a fortnight, Ponsonby for only 3 days. As was the case with Phillips who had won Mid-Lanark in 1888, and Trevelyan, it was obviously seen as important for non-Scots with Scottish seats to associate themselves with Scottish interests quickly and as overtly as possible, and support for Scottish Home Rule had become the established method of doing so.

The most famous Englishman with a Scottish constituency, Asquith, voted in favour of the Bill too, though he was not sufficiently enthusiastic to provide any further parliamentary time. A second reading for the Bill was called but never happened. The division list also revealed that both Redmond and Dillon had voted for the proposal (26).

August 1908 saw the appearance of the last of the Scottish nationalist periodicals we shall consider. In some ways The Thistle was the most substantial of them. It was edited by T. D. Wanliss, the nationalist author of the 1880s and 1890s. "A Scottish Patriotic Magazine", The Thistle was to run to 1918, monthly. It was dedicated to Home Rule all round and

the introduction of Scottish Home Rule simultaneously with Irish. "The Policy of The Thistle" was set out in the first number, and Wanliss showed some of the resentment of Irish nationalism the Scots patriots often felt.

> And while this glaring measure of injustice is dealt out to the Scots, not merely in the matter of national sentiment, but also in grossly material affairs, a very different policy is adopted by the English majority in the British Parliament towards the people of Ireland. While Scotland has to fight for years to get her most urgent needs attended to, the demands of the Irish M.P.s, in almost every question but the granting of Home Rule, are most obsequiously granted, whether the party in power be Liberal or Conservative.... The English people have to be, so to speak, kicked into fair play.... Let a purely independent Scottish party be formed pledged to independent action. Or if they form any alliance at all, let it be with the Irish and Welsh parties in Parliament.

Waddie and Gulland had both suggested that the Scottish members form themselves into a coherent parliamentary group. It was an idea that Wanliss was frequently promoting in the Thistle. In 2 articles the next year he asserted that the Liberal leadership would never willingly grant Home Rule all round, but:

> When there is a Scottish National Party in the House of Commons of say twenty-five members, these joined to the seventy Irish and thirty Welsh members could compel the selfish and reluctant English members to do justice to Scotland, Ireland and Wales. Then, and then only, when we get Home Rule all round, can we have a happy and a united British people! (27).

Wanliss was of course presuming that the Irish, whom he admitted would make up the largest contingent of this Celtic army, would favour Home Rule all round. The 1906 election produced 58 Scottish Liberal members. It is interesting that Wanliss believed that 25 of these would form a Party to press Scottish Home Rule. This can be compared with his

figure for Wales of 30: the entire Welsh representation (26 Liberals and 4 Labour). Clearly he would discount Asquith and Haldane and Churchill as likely National Party stalwarts. But if one discounts all members for Scottish seats who held any office between 1908 and 1914 there were still 43 Liberal and 2 Labour members who were entirely backbench, and thus possible members of a National Party (28).

No Scottish Liberal M.P., on the available evidence, spoke out against the concept of Scottish Home Rule after 1900. This of course included Asquith. Wanliss' figure is therefore interesting as a pointer to the number of members genuinely enthusiastic about the idea: just under half the total Scottish Liberals, just over half of the backbenchers.

In March 1909, Charles Waddie, as in the 1890s, approached the S.L.P., this time suggesting they organise a conference on Home Rule and invite representatives from Scotland, Ireland and Wales. He was again turned down but the party's reply was more friendly in tone than previously. They suggested that he might like to bring his idea forward again to their General Council when there was more time to discuss it. The 1910 S.L.P. conference received 8 resolutions on Scottish Home Rule, one of which they passed, while no mention was made at all of Ireland (29).

Asquith called a general election in January 1910, resulting from the Lords' rejection of Lloyd George's 1909 budget. The Liberal majority was cut dramatically, though in Scotland they increased their representation by one seat. Asquith was

now dependent on the Irish nationalists for a working majority. It had been clear that the greatest obstacle to Irish Home Rule was the House of Lords. With the Irish now in a commanding position in the Commons, and the Lords facing a reduction of their powers, Home Rule seemed to be on the way.

During the election campaign, Wanliss wrote furiously in the Thistle of the prospect of a returned Liberal government putting forward Irish Home Rule alone.

> Evidently the matter has been discussed by the ministry, and the decision arrived at is that Home Rule is to be given to Ireland, but is to be denied to Scotland and to Wales. This is the old dirty and shameful policy, born of selfishness and of national bigotry, which has been the policy of the English Liberals for the last thirty or forty years.... And why are Scotland and Wales in this matter to be treated differently from Ireland? It certainly is not that these two nationalities are unfitted for self-government. On the contrary they are more fit for it than either England or Ireland. No. It is because of their complete fitness for self-government; because of their orderliness, their high intelligence, and their indisposition to resort to violence, that their claim for the management of their national affairs is denied to them.... The policy of violence and law-breaking has now become the most potent factor in the working of the British constitution (30).

After the election, Wanliss recovered his composure. In an article "Paddy is King" he accepted that Irish Home Rule would be going forward alone and wrote that the Irish would certainly deserve their Home Rule when it came, and that it should be celebrated as the first step to Home Rule all round. In another issue he praised John Redmond for his moderation and remarked that in an age of "great empires" the United Kingdom must hold together. The extremists in Ireland, he wrote, knew nothing of political realities (31).

In June 1910 21 Scottish Liberal M.P.s formed themselves into a Scottish Nationalist Committee. Led by the Y.S.S. group, the Committee included Munro Ferguson and Pirie. They published their Manifesto to the Scottish People in August. This document opened:

> The Committee to promote national self-government for Scotland has been formed at the instance of Scottish Liberal members having long experience of the parliamentary and departmental conditions governing Scottish affairs. It appeals for support to all those interested in Scottish legislation and administration.

The Committee's main complaint was against the bureaucracy of Scottish administration, devolution would "break with the antiquated procedure of two centuries". The creation of the Scottish office in 1885, which had raised hopes in Scotland, had in fact made conditions worse, they claimed. Legislation for Scotland now came straight from the Scottish office or Scotch Education Board, both based in London, to parliament, without Scottish M.P.s having a chance to study it or comment on it first.

The Manifesto made no mention of Ireland. Nor did it explicitly deal with the question of Home Rule priority. But the Committee's view was obvious enough from the Manifesto's conclusion:

> The moment is opportune to raise this question, for under any comprehensive scheme of Constitutional Reform it is essential to provide for the representation of the nationalities of the United Kingdom upon a proper basis through devolution. We call upon our fellow-countrymen to support this movement, confidently believing that we shall not appeal in vain to the good sense and patriotism of the Scottish people (32).

Asquith called another general election in December 1910 at the request of the King, who promised to create sufficient peers to pass the Parliament Bill if the Liberals were returned and could not get the Bill through the Lords without such a creation. The election produced a House of Commons very similar to the January election. In Scotland 2 seats changed hands: the Unionists captured St. Andrews and the Liberals Kirkcudbright, leaving the overall position unchanged. During the campaign Asquith mentioned the possibility of Home Rule all round speaking in his own constituency of East Fife. This encouraged Wanliss of the Thistle to revert to his earlier position and demand that Asquith showed himself to be an honourable man by introducing one comprehensive federal Home Rule scheme (33).

With Liberal victory in the second 1910 election, the prospects of an Irish Home Rule Bill moved a step nearer. The Y.S.S. reorganised itself to press again for Home Rule to include Scotland. They adopted a conciliatory stance towards the government, accepting that an Irish Bill would be brought forward first but asking Asquith to commit himself to following it with federalism. In May 1911 they invited John Redmond to speak in Edinburgh. The chair at the meeting was taken by the current Y.S.S. President C. E. Price, M.P. for Edinburgh Central and a partner in the biscuit makers McVitie and Price. Redmond, while of course maintaining Ireland's right of priority in Home Rule, did not disappoint his audience:

> But in this country, for a population of over forty millions, there was only one Parliament to manage the

> affairs of England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, and the great international and imperial affairs of an Empire world-wide and comprising hundreds of millions of people. The system was absolutely ridiculous. He believed the greatest service the granting of Home Rule to Ireland would mean for Great Britain was that it would be undoubtedly the first step in a process which would in the end mean the devolution of local affairs to all parts of the United Kingdom (34).

The Y.S.S. followed the meeting up by issuing a "Manifesto and Appeal to the Scottish People on Scottish Home Rule" in July. This 4 page pamphlet briefly outlined the history of the society. It described the battle against the Lords as the vital issue of the previous 2 years. With that satisfactorily concluded "the Y.S.S. returns to its Home Rule propaganda, and intends to push that issue with all the energy it can command". It ended:

> The destruction of the veto of the Peers, the grant of Home Rule to Ireland, and the consequent change in the constitution give to Scotland a great opportunity to regain her freedom. A federal system is the only possible and enduring solution of the constitutional difficulty. Wherever incorporation has been tried it has proved a success, allaying jealousy and racial animosity, and bringing about that strongest of all unions - the union of co-operation.... To attempt the grant of Home Rule to Ireland without regard to the necessities of the other nations is to court disaster.

The Scottish Home Rulers were now beginning to sound as if Irish Home Rule had not only been introduced but had come into effect. In fact, though the government was engaged in planning the Bill, there were to be 2 debates on Scottish Home Rule before Asquith introduced the Irish Bill. The first of these, in August 1911, was initiated by Sir Henry Dalziel, one of the signatories of the M.P.s Manifesto, who had introduced similar resolutions in 1894 and 1895.

Dalziel reminded the House that the question of Scottish devolution had been around for 20 years, and insisted that it was even more necessary now than it had been when first proposed. He mentioned the kind of legislature he envisaged: a single chamber of 140 members, roughly 2 from each existing constituency. It would deal with all exclusively Scottish matters; all military and foreign considerations would be left with the Imperial Parliament. He referred in friendly terms to Ireland, saying that he thought a proper scheme of federalism could only strengthen the Irish case.

> I need hardly say that it is not in any spirit of rivalry or in any sense of antagonism that we are bringing forward this measure. Scotland has always been loyal to the Irish demand. Scotland is loyal now, and will remain loyal until Ireland has achieved her purpose and desire. We believe that in bringing forward a measure of this kind, and in making our claim, we are strengthening the Irish position. We believe that the more the Irish demand is presented to the country as part of a general settlement on lines applicable to other portions of the United Kingdom, the stronger will be the support given by the British electors to the Irish appeal.

His phrasing was friendly enough to get 4 Irish votes in the division, which he won 172 to 73: J. J. Clancy, William O'Brien, Tim Healy and T. P. O'Connor (35).

In October 1911 the annual conference of the S.L.P. blessed the idea of an Irish Home Rule Bill, while keeping forward Scotland's claim in its first resolution:

> That this Council earnestly hopes that the Government may have every success in carrying through the House of Commons next year a Home Rule Bill for Ireland, and respectfully presses upon the Government the urgent need for a Home Rule Bill for Scotland being also pushed forward without delay (36).

With their Home Rule Bill scheduled for early the following year, the Irish were stepping up their propaganda. The Irish

Home Rule Council offered the S.L.P. speakers to tour in Scotland, speaking of course only on Ireland. Edward J. Kelly, M.P. for Donegal East, spent a week in the autumn of 1911 in the Lothians and Fife: according to the report to the S.L.P. Organising Committee the meetings had been well-attended and successful. It had been arranged for Richard McGhee M.P. to come, also to the east of Scotland, in January 1912 (37).

On February 28 1912, Dr. Chapple moved that:

> any measure providing for the delegation of Parliamentary powers to Ireland should be followed in this Parliament by the granting of similar powers of self-government to Scotland as part of a general scheme of devolution.

He opened his speech by saying:

> In moving this resolution I would like to say that my support of Home Rule for Ireland is not conditional on any promise by the Government to support this motion. I am prepared to support Home Rule for Ireland upon its merits.

Chapple, another Scottish nationalist from the Colonies, having been a member of the New Zealand parliament until 1906, thus initiated the best Scottish Home Rule Bill for some time. 1912 was the year of Home Rule: a Scottish debate made for a quiet start, and some 10 members spoke.

Chapple was seconded by Munro Ferguson, who asked for a declaration of faith in the principle of Home Rule all round:

> On the eve of a third effort to deal with the case of Ireland in this House we invite the House to resolve that the delegation of powers from this House to subordinate legislatures is essential to the good government of each division of the United Kingdom, as well as to the unity and security of the Empire as a whole.

As to Ireland, the proposers of the resolution "as frankly

accord their claim for priority as they will accord us our right of succession".

There were 4 speeches of opposition, including a brief one by the new Unionist leader, Bonar Law, limbering up for the Irish debates. Two Unionists attacked the Y.S.S. Lord Tullibardine, the son of the Duke of Atholl, pointed out the inconsistency of demand of the Y.S.S. members. In Scotland they were warlike and demanded immediate Home Rule, at Westminster they were like "doves" and requested the government to consider Scotland when Ireland was safely passed; the same criticism as had been levelled at Clark for his S.H.R.A. membership 20 years earlier. Sir George Younger, the opposition Scottish whip, did not concern himself with the substance of Y.S.S. speeches: as a "society of youthful prigs" who were "the laughing-stock of every serious and grown-up politician" they did not merit it.

The new Secretary for Scotland, T. Mackinnon Wood, who had been appointed a fortnight earlier, made his first contribution to a Scottish Home Rule debate. He said he was personally in favour of the motion, but added hastily: "I am not in a position to pledge the Government as to time and priority". The motion got a majority 226 to 128, but was again dropped. Five Irish nationalists voted for, including Stephen Gwynn who had said in a brief speech that the best service Ireland could do for Scotland was to get her Home Rule running quickly. The minority in the division contained the names of 2 Irish unionists of whom much was to be heard in the next 2 years: Carson and Craig (38).

On April 11 1912 Asquith at last introduced the third Irish Home Rule Bill. In a long speech, though nothing to compare with Gladstone's efforts, Home Rule all round was mentioned only once. But the paragraph on federalism was stronger than most supporters had dared to hope. Asquith, who had not been noted for excessive enthusiasm for Scottish Home Rule, blossomed like a Y.S.S. orator.

> I myself, while recognising to the full the priority and paramount urgency of the Irish claim have always presented the case for Irish Home Rule as the first step, and only the first step in a larger and more comprehensive policy. I said so with the utmost distinctness in a speech which I made on the second reading of the Bill of 1893, and in the twenty years which have since elapsed there is not one year which has not illustrated and emphasised with ever-growing cogency and clearness the imperative need, in the interests of the United Kingdom and of the Empire as a whole, for the emancipation from local cares and local burdens of the Imperial Parliament (39).

The observant would have noticed, however, that this rousing tribute to the spirit of federalism contained no commitment to bring in any further Home Rule Bills!

Both the Thistle and the Fiery Cross, the surviving Scottish nationalist periodicals, had their say on the Irish Bill. Wanliss wrote that while a Bill for Ireland alone was not what they wanted, they would just have to accept it and the Prime Minister's word that it was only the first instalment. He suggested that the government move the Scotch Board of Education from London to Edinburgh as a gesture of good faith to the Scottish people (40). Napier produced an idea of characteristic eccentricity. He wanted the House of Lords to:

> pass amendments on the Irish Home Rule Bill, so as to make it applicable immediately to the other nationalities of the United Kingdom; or, in other words, to

> create local National Parliaments or Councils for England, Scotland and Wales, as well as Ireland, and form besides an Imperial Federation Parliament, not only for the United Kingdom but for the whole British Empire, including Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and also with nominees for India and any other British possessions (41).

The Edinburgh United Liberal Committee held a meeting on Irish Home Rule in May. The speakers were Joseph Devlin M.P. of Belfast, and an English Liberal, C. S. Horne. They both concentrated on the problem of Ulster in their speeches and neither man said anything of Scotland. The chair, however, was taken by Gulland who assured his audience that the successful implementation of Irish Home Rule would be followed by a Bill for Scotland (42).

On July 3 as the Irish Bill passed in the Commons for the first time, Alexander MacCallum Scott (Glasgow Bridgeton) moved the first reading of a Home Rule all round Bill. This was the Scottish Home Rulers second attempt in 4 months, but Scott appealed to the best authority:

> ... the case for this Bill has already been stated much more eloquently and forcibly than I can hope to do by the Prime Minister when introducing the Government of Ireland Bill. My task is further simplified by the fact that this Bill is based upon the Government of Ireland Bill, and is an adaptation of that measure to a scheme of Home Rule all round.

The proposers of the Bill were certainly "all round": 4 from Scotland, 3 from Wales and 3 from England. A speech of opposition was delivered by Captain Craig before the Bill was passed, 264 to 212; and went the way of its predecessors (43).

The annual conference of the S.L.P. in October expressed its confidence in the government, "especially" over Irish Home Rule. It also kept up the pressure for Scotland, agreeing to form a Scottish Home Rule Council. This Council grew out of a deputation to the Commons, mounted by the Y.S.S. and received by a group of Scottish Liberal M.P.s. The Liberal Association, the Liberal M.P.s, the Y.S.S. and the Scottish Women's Liberal Federation would each contribute 5 members to the Council which was to keep the case for Scottish devolution before the Scottish public and the government (44). Roland Muirhead and Tom Johnston, later to be a keen Scottish Home Ruler between the wars and Labour Scottish Secretary, were 2 of the representatives of the Y.S.S.

By the beginning of 1913 it was becoming clear that a major crisis was developing over Ulster resistance to the Irish Bill. Ulster Protestants declared their intention to oppose the implementation of the Bill with force, if necessary. Their threats were assiduously encouraged by many Unionists, notably Bonar Law, the Unionist leader. Asquith and his government decided to ignore these protestations and clamourings over the possibility of civil war. They believed, or hoped, that if they could get Home Rule afloat Ulster would become reconciled to the idea of an Irish Parliament. They played down the strength of the North's objections and derided Ulster fears of papist rule.

The Scottish Home Rulers followed the government's line. The S.L.P. continued to support Irish speakers coming to

Scotland: J. J. Clancy, Richard McGhee and W. H. Davey of the Ulster Guardian in 1913 (45). Wanliss' Thistle ran a series of editorials on Ulster between the end of 1912 and the beginning of 1914. He appealed to Ulster Presbyterians not to be duped by the Tories and Carson, who had only the interests of the landlords at heart:

> Irish Home Rule stands, then, for Liberalism in land legislation, and for Liberalism in religious thought; while Sir Edward Carson's so-called Unionist policy stands for exactly the opposite (46).

The Scottish Home Rulers in parliament were back in 1913 with another Bill. Introducing the second reading, W. H. Cowan (Aberdeenshire East) took the confident line that the Irish Bill, thanks to the Parliament Act, was now safe.

> An epoch-making event has occurred; the Irish Home Rule Bill has been passed in this House through all its stages under circumstances such as never existed before and which I am profoundly thankful to find exist now and which ensure for the Bill a safe passage to the Throne.... Therefore we can assume with absolute confidence that that Bill will become law in the life-time of this Parliament, and that an Irish Parliament will meet in Dublin.... It is because we recognise that Ireland is safe that we are free to act at what we believe to be the psychological moment for our country.

Cowan quoted Gladstone's declaration on parity of principle in support of his argument that the time was now right to proceed to Scottish Home Rule. Though he admitted this was a private member's Bill, he claimed it was only one by strict parliamentary definition.

> I desire to take the earliest opportunity of explaining to the House that I am not introducing this Bill as an individual private member, nor on behalf of any small group or section of members, but on behalf of the whole body of Liberal Scottish members in this House. I should like to remind the House that when I speak on behalf of the whole body of Scottish Liberal members,

> I speak on behalf of 85 per cent of the total representation in this House.... The Scottish Liberal members to a man are declared and convinced Home Rulers. That seems rather curious if there is no demand for Home Rule in Scotland. It is well-known that ours is a cautious race, and I am perfectly certain that Scottish members would never be so foolish as to place themselves far ahead of public opinion in Scotland upon so vital a matter as this.

This was another good debate. Elevem members spoke. Those in favour included O'Connor from Ireland and E. T. John from Wales. Mackinnon Wood made his 2 declarations: in favour personally, uncommitted as Scottish Secretary, though he did add that "the government hopes the House will give the Bill a second reading". Their hopes were not disappointed, the Bill getting the reading by 204 to 159, a good number of Irish members voting in favour. The Bill also succeeded in getting one day in Committee after the second reading before disappearing (47).

If Home Rulers remained, at least in public, optimistic about the smooth implementation of Irish Home Rule, there were many who did not share their view. Some Unionists gave the impression of almost relishing the possibility of civil war in Ireland, but many moderate Unionists, and indeed many Liberals, were anxious to find a solution to what appeared to be an inevitable crisis. One of the most dramatic manifestations of the desire for compromise came from R. T. Reid, now Lord Loreburn. He had resigned from the Woolsack because of ill-health in June 1912. Fifteen months later, and without consulting any of the government, he wrote a long letter to The Times arguing that the time

had come to agree on some special form of treatment for Ulster (48). His erstwhile colleagues and the Irish nationalists were furious at this intervention, partly because they felt that his suggestion could only strengthen Ulster's campaign against Home Rule, and partly because Loreburn had, when a member of the government, been resolutely opposed to concessions for Ulster.

Pressed by Asquith, Loreburn produced a detailed memorandum proposing "Home Rule within Home Rule" for Ulster. Reid had, as we have seen, always been a keen advocate of federalism, and his argument here had a certain logic and continuity seen in that context. Others too were looking at federalism as a way out of the Irish crisis: the idea was, thanks to Ulster, receiving the kind of serious consideration that it had, despite the best efforts of the Scottish Home Rulers, never had before (49).

One such group looking at federalism in 1913 and 1914 were those, mostly Unionists, in the Round Table Movement. The movement had been founded in 1909 and was principally concerned with the idea of Imperial Federation, which had its roots in the thinking of Cecil Rhodes and Milner. Its leaders came from Milner's South African "Kindergarten" and included one Scot: Philip Kerr. The Master of Elibank, another Scot and an ex-Liberal M.P. was on the fringes. The Round Table group's idea was to examine the possibility of extending federation backwards to the United Kingdom. This would have had the attraction to them that they would have

been able to present a truly Imperial Parliament, freed from domestic considerations, to the Empire (50).

Frederick Scott Oliver was not directly connected with the Round Table Movement, though he knew some of its members, but he too turned his attention to federalism as a solution of the Home Rule crisis. Oliver was born in Edinburgh in 1864. He attended Edinburgh and Cambridge Universities before joining the business of Debenham and Freebody. He made a fortune for the firm, and one for himself. He bought an estate in the Borders and turned to studying and writing on history and politics. After writing a successful book on Alexander Hamilton (1906), he took up the cause of federalism, devoting 3 books to it: Federalism and Home Rule (1910), The Alternative to Civil War (1913), and What Federalism is Not (1914). Oliver did not approach the subject as an enthusiast for Scottish Home Rule. He considered it merely as a rational and sensible solution to the problems produced by Irish Home Rule.

Given this approach, it is not surprising that Oliver's books were not dramatic battle-cries for a new future. He was free with his criticism of all sides: accusing the Irish of asking for too much, the government of granting too much, and the Unionists of unreasoning hysteria. He proposed reducing the powers of the Irish Bill and then passing it as a bi-partisan measure (51). Exactly the same Bill should then be passed for Scotland and later for England. He insisted that federalism could only work if each nation was given the same powers.

The very titles of his 2 later books breathed a defeatist air. And at the end of The Alternative to Civil War, Oliver admitted that his theory, while workable, would require major concessions by both parties (52). The conclusion of What Federalism is Not, published when the situation looked even more desperate in February 1914, was not much more hopeful, though it did stake the claim for federalism as a saviour:

> Federalism alone can extricate us from our present entanglement. It is the only solution of the Irish question, because it is the only means which enables nationalists to realise their ideal of Irish unity, while allowing Unionists to keep inviolate the Union of the three Kingdoms (53).

In May 1914 the Scottish Home Rulers presented their last Bill of the period. J. I. Macpherson (Ross and Cromarty) in a short speech offered the House the same Bill as Cowan's of the year before, with the addition of female suffrage for a Scottish parliament. This addition caused some difficulty, the seconder, William Young (East Perthshire), taking time out of his speech to condemn it. The speakers for the motion continued to assert serenely that the Irish Bill was now safely on its way to becoming law so the House could consider the next phase of Home Rule.

Most of the Scottish Liberals advanced purely pragmatic arguments for devolution. Only Eugene Wason, long a Home Ruler and now quite a veteran member having been first elected in 1885, raised the flag of nationalism.

> It is because we on this side are firm believers in Scottish nationalism and in the right of the Scottish people to make Scottish laws in the Scottish capital without the interference of English, Welsh, or Irish members, that we support the principles embodied in

> this Bill. I consider that Wales, Ireland, and Scotland are each and every one separate and independent nationalities, and that the law for those different parts of the United Kingdom ought to be made in accordance with the wishes of the representatives of those countries.

The debate was adjourned after 12 members had spoken. Five days later Pirie and Hogge asked for the debate to be continued in government time during Prime Minister's questions. With the First World War only 2 months away, the war that would destroy the Irish Home Rule Bill finally, Asquith put the seal on 30 years of campaigning for Scottish Home Rule:

> I am afraid that the time at the disposal of the Government will not admit of a second day being given for the discussion of the Bill named (54).

One of Scotland's leading historians has written:

> It does seem possible that if the First World War had not come along when it did, and Irish Home Rule had been put into operation successfully in 1914, then Scottish Home Rule might conceivably have followed, provided that a Liberal administration had continued, as it might well have done until the current parliament reached its limit in 1916 (55).

It seems to me that it would be difficult to argue against this statement, with its many qualifications. The notion of the accident of war killing off imminent federalism is not tenable. There is no evidence to suggest that the Unionists' and Ulster's objections to Home Rule were likely to recede. Even if Irish Home Rule had been successfully put into operation, it seems naive to suppose that the bulk of the Unionist party would not have opposed its extension to Scotland equally vigorously.

This is not to suggest that the movement for Scottish Home Rule was about to go into decline. As far as the publicists were concerned the movement had survived its worst blows in 1912, when Waddie had died and Napier had closed the Fiery Cross and left Scotland. The nationalist press gained a new member in fact, in 1914, when the Hon. Ruairi Erskine of Marr revived the Marquess of Bute's Scottish Review (56). One of the writers he recruited was Hogge of the Y.S.S. There was certainly no evidence of any lessening of enthusiasm by the Scottish Liberal M.P.s.

What then did the movement for Scottish Home Rule from 1880 to 1914 owe to Ireland, and what did it make of that country? Unquestionably Scottish nationalism, both before the period and since, had its own independent impetus. Equally unquestionably the phase of Scottish nationalism that this chapter has been looking at was directly inspired by Ireland. Or perhaps, less initially by Ireland than by the conversion to Home Rule of Gladstone, who was held in enormous respect in Scotland.

Nationalism per se, of the emotional appeal, played its part in Scotland, but it was a relatively minor part. There was a widespread belief, also shared by some Unionists, that Scotland and Scottish affairs did not receive the attention due to them in parliament. Devolution would provide a sensible answer to this problem. There was also pride in Scotland as a country of progress and distinction, of empire-builders. Why should such a country not have the right to

direct its own affairs? More particularly, why should Scotland not have Home Rule if it was to be offered to a country less loyal and less responsible than herself? Some of the more advanced nationalists saw Ireland as a shining example of Celtic patriotism. But many Scottish Home Rulers did not. They had been prepared to rub along with the status quo, but if Home Rule was a practical possibility, then it should be granted to the most deserving of the Celtic nations, the nation that had lost its independence through fraud and bribery a century before Ireland.

The problem for the Scottish Home Rulers was that, unlike their Irish counterparts, they could not demonstrate an overwhelming desire for Home Rule among their electors. It is often said that the Irish Parliamentary Party lost touch with opinion in Ireland in the years following Parnell's death. In a sense the Scottish Liberals demonstrated this process in reverse. Living so much at Westminster and in the atmosphere of Home Rule, they moved ahead of the Scottish people in their desire for Home Rule.

The Scots then occupied an ambivalent position towards Ireland. They could not deny that they had the Irish to thank for the whole idea of Home Rule being considered. The Irish had to be honoured for showing the way. At the same time, the emotion surrounding the Irish demand delayed the implementation of Scottish Home Rule, which they wished to present as a pragmatic concession to a pragmatic and sensible nation. And they could not escape being compared with

Ireland, a comparison from which they felt they suffered in 2 ways. First, it associated them with disloyalty and extremism. Secondly, it showed up the relative weakness of the popular call for Home Rule in Scotland.

As we have seen, there were many calls for the Scottish Liberals to form themselves into a party on the Irish model. The problem with this idea, which at first seemed so attractive, was the obvious one: they were Liberals. To exert any pressure on the government they would have needed to have asserted their independence. If they asserted it, as they did, by holding Scottish Home Rule debates, they received friendly, patronising and useless murmurs of support from the government. But they could not try to proclaim their independence by opposing government legislation because, as Liberals, they believed in it.

The Parliament Act, for example, was seen as a necessary prerequisite to any Home Rule. It was also extremely popular in Scotland, a country that was broadly more radical than England. To have refused to support it as a gesture of warning to the government would have alienated their electorate, who cared more for curbing the Lords than they did for Home Rule.

There was the possibility of refusing to back Irish Home Rule unless the Bill ran concurrently with an act for Scotland. But to have done so would have made a logical nonsense of their own position. Home Rule was, in any case, running into quite enough trouble without its own friends

turning against it. If the Unionists had succeeded in killing Irish Home Rule, then Scottish Home Rule had no chance of even starting.

There was a strong logical argument for one measure of federalism. Asquith and his government knew, however, from past experience that to pass any form of Home Rule was going to be a struggle. In practical terms, few could blame them for deciding to go for Ireland alone and not cumbering the issue with a country which could not demonstrate an overwhelming popular demand for it. The Scottish Home Rulers knew that the Liberal party, of which the great majority of them were members, was the only hope for Home Rule. Once Asquith had made his decision they could only support it, make the best of it, and trust to his promise that Irish Home Rule would only be the first instalment.

CHAPTER 4: CUNNINGHAME GRAHAM AND THE EARLY LABOUR MOVEMENT

> History of any kind is generally written for one of two objects: either to falsify some set of political events or to show the writer's erudition.
>
> Cunninghame Graham: Notes on the District of Menteith

Robert Bontine Cunninghame Graham was the most fascinating figure of late nineteenth century Scotland. A Perthshire laird, he spent his early life as a gaucho and rancher in south and central America. His experiences there gave him a wider perspective on British civilisation than most. The happiness he found in the relative freedom and lack of restraint of the cowboy life left him with a feeling of distance and exclusion when he turned to the world of London society and government. He rapidly became famous, and notorious, as an ultra advanced radical. He was genuinely unimpressed by either the personages or the panoply of government, and he retained an unswervingly scornful hatred of hypocrisy of any kind. Though he can be truly called the first socialist to sit in parliament there was also much of the High Tory in him. He delighted in Andrew Lang's discovery that he was the rightful hereditary King of Scotland. His position as a socialist, and as a sort of conservative anarchist, led him to hold the manufacturers and capitalists of the Liberal party in a deep and ever increasing contempt. He derided their solid security, their nonconformity, their piety and their self-righteousness and self-satisfaction. During his years in parliament, he constituted a bitter and flamboyant one-man opposition.

Above all, he disliked and derided their success. All his life he had a passion for defending and speaking up for the oppressed, the downtrodden and those who could not speak up for themselves. On the literal level, this meant campaigns for the better treatment of horses. In parliamentary terms, it meant ferocious championing of the workers in the midst of their masters. It meant a passion that went beyond the normal expressions of dissent and revelled in outraging people.

One of his most famous sketches, "Success", expounded his belief that "Failure alone can interest speculative minds". This attack on success encapsulates most of Graham's approach to life.

> Caricatures in bronze and marble, and titles made ridiculous by their exotic style we shower upon all those who have succeeded, in war, in literature, or art; we give them money, and for a season no African Lucullus in Park Lane can dine without them ....
>
> For those who fail, for those who have sunk still battling beneath the muddy waves of life, we keep our love, and that curiosity about their lives which makes their memories green when the cheap gold is dusted over, which once we gave success.
>
> How few successful men are interesting!" (1).

In some ways Graham was the best evidence for his thesis. His ventures in the Americas and Spain were invariably disasters in practical terms, and he failed in his effort to pay off the debts on his estate and hold onto it. In politics he achieved little or nothing. Further illustrating his belief, he left Labour when it was about to at last become a power, after fighting for it through difficult and unreward-years. For the last part of his life he turned to another

minority cause, Scottish nationalism. To use his aggressive political gifts, he needed to have the scope that only a weak and seemingly hopeless movement could afford him.

Such a judgement, however, is unnecessarily harsh. Graham's example and inspiration moved Scottish radicals from Keir Hardie to Hugh MacDiarmid. He was also a prolific author of short stories and sketches that were widely admired. Joseph Conrad, for example, considered Graham's approval, as a fellow-writer, to be high endorsement of his work (2). From 1895 Graham published 17 volumes of short stories and sketches. He also wrote some South American history, but it is on the stories that his reputation as a writer, then and since, has rested. The skill and economy of his work, and particularly the gentle and unforced way in which he put across his message, made many of his stories moving, poignant and effective. He was a master of quiet understatement when writing, something he never managed to be in the political arena, and his work gained from it. His disgust with much of modern western civilisation was nonetheless unmistakable in his books, and the scorn and contempt underlay what he wrote, as it did what he said and did.

Graham worried during his years in the Labour movement that he would not be taken seriously as a representative of socialism. His fear was justified in that, because of his social position, he continued to be tolerated and accepted by much of the governing class. He became an exotic, a spectacular part of the scene, but a man not to be taken

entirely seriously. To a large extent, his friends who fostered the legend of Cunninghame Graham, contributed to this. This was unfair to Graham who was always in earnest. It was, and is, easy to make fun of his dandyism, his vanity and his flamboyance. It is equally easy to see that he made many mistakes and to criticise his writing for its lapses into Rousseauesque pastoralism. But his ultimate sincerity and genuine desire to fight for a better world should not be doubted.

This chapter will concentrate on Cunninghame Graham's attitude to the Irish, principally in the earlier parts of his career. To avoid the mistake, outlined above, of treating him just as an isolated figure, however, it will also deal with James Keir Hardie and the Scottish Labour Party of 1888-94, with which Graham was closely associated.

Cunninghame Graham turned his attention to politics in the general election of 1885. He was 33 years old and had settled permanently in Scotland when his father died 2 years earlier, abandoning South America and Texas for the difficult inheritance of the debt-ridden estate of Gartmore in Perthshire. He was adopted as Liberal candidate for North West Lanark. He had first shown an interest in another seat, Glasgow Blackfriars and Hutchesontown, but had withdrawn when he discovered that the Georgite Scottish Land Restoration League was proposing to run Shaw Maxwell for the constituency. It was a clear indication of how radical Graham was that he had no wish to oppose the League; and his

manifesto to North West Lanark confirmed this. He told the electors that he favoured free education, graduated income tax, reform of the land laws and a retrenching foreign policy (3).

He also declared for Home Rule for Ireland. In this he was, of course, in advance of Gladstone and the bulk of the Liberal party. Graham lost the election by 1103 votes to his Tory opponent, John Baird. The Scotsman, which disapproved of Graham's radical stance, remarked derisively that he had "contrived to lose a pretty safe seat". Adam Anderson, a leading Liberal in the constituency, replied to the paper's allegation, blaming Graham's defeat on Parnell's instruction to Irish voters in Britain to vote Tory. North West Lanark had a sizeable Irish population and Anderson wrote:

> I have never heard a single elector blame Mr. Graham for our defeat. On the contrary, it is the opinion of all these that no Liberal could have carried the seat unless Mr. Parnell had cancelled his manifesto (4).

Graham again contested North West Lanark in the 1886 general election. During the campaign he wrote to the Edinburgh Daily Review in response to an article they had published questioning the enthusiasm of many Liberal candidates for Irish Home Rule. He took the opportunity of reiterating that his conversion to Home Rule predated Gladstone's:

> I hasten to assure you that I, for one, am a hearty supporter of the Government Bill, and to remind you that ... I had expressed myself in favour of an Irish Parliament before Mr. Gladstone made public his Irish policy. I do not believe for one moment that I am the only one, ... and I feel confident that many men will be found equal to the occasion, able to rise above

> class prejudice, and willing to show that Scotland appreciates Mr. Gladstone's heroic effort, and the noble spirit of independence manifested by the vast majority of Irishmen in this supreme attempt to attain that birthright of free men - the right to manage their own affairs (5).

This time Graham was successful, unseating Baird by 332 votes. This election, following the defeat of the first Home Rule Bill, saw the Irish voters in Britain encouraged whole-heartedly, for the first time, to support the Liberals. Much was to be said by Graham over the next 10 years about the position of the Irish vote in Scottish elections. On this occasion, it does seem tenable to ascribe Graham's change of fortune to that source. As well as maintaining his support for Irish Home Rule, Graham was also one of the first to join the new Scottish Home Rule Association.

He lost no time in making his mark at Westminster, delivering his Maiden Speech during the debate on the Queen's Speech of Salisbury's government. His speech was a furious attack on the government for its complacency, its ignorance of the degree of misery and poverty in the country and its unwillingness to introduce any social legislation. He made mild fun of the Royal family and assailed military imperialism: " ... we laughed like parrots at a bagpiper, when we looked at the sketches in the illustrated papers depicting Natives running away from our troops". He closed his speech on Ireland, attacking Irish landlords and referring to the notorious evictions at Glenbeigh, in Donegal.

> The Government had lighted a light that would serve to light the Liberals on their path. The homes destroyed in Glenbeigh were, no doubt, as dear to the poor

> peasant, in his lonely village on the stony mountain side in the far west, as was the shoddy mansion in South Kensington to the capitalist, as was Haddon Hall to its owner, or as was Buckingham Palace to the absentee owner of that dreadful building. Who could say that the affairs of this handful of obscure tenants in a windswept and rainbedewed stony corner of Ireland, might not prove to have given the first blow to that society in which one man worked and another enjoyed the fruit - that society in which capital and luxury made a Heaven for 30,000 and a Hell for 30,000,000 - that society whose crowning achievement was this dreary waste of mud and stucco - with its misery, its want and destitution, its degradation, its prostitution, and its glaring social inequalities - the society which we called London - that society which, by a refinement of irony, had placed the mainspring of human action, almost the power of life and death, and the absolute power to pay labour and reward honour, behind the grey tweed veil which enshrouded the greasy pocket-book of the capitalist (6).

This speech, a nice illustration of Graham's facility with language, caused an uproar in the House. From then on he was a celebrity who could always be ensured a good audience. His message, though he avoided spelling it out, was socialism. The sympathy for the Irish was clear enough, but Graham was also calling for the uniting of socialism and nationalism against the status quo. He was looking past Home Rule to the land war which he identified as the most radical aspect of the Irish movement. What he hoped for was the possibility of an Irish movement, radicalised by its own left-wing, which saw its natural allies in Britain not as being just Gladstone and the bulk of the Liberals, but looked for its allies among the socialists, the land reformers and the most advanced Liberals.

It was surely in pursuit of this ideal that he took a leading role in the "Battle of Trafalgar Square" in November

1887. Under new regulations, an open-air meeting to protest at the imprisonment of the leaders of the Irish Plan of Campaign, notably William O'Brien, was banned. The ban turned the proposed meeting into a major cause for all the radical and socialist organisations in London. Its scope widened to include a general protest against hardship and the high level of unemployment. Thousands turned out from the east end of London for the demonstration and converged on Trafalgar Square where they were met by a large force of police.

Graham was by no means the only radical leader present, but he was the only M.P., and he and his friend John Burns were the only prominent men up at the front. William Morris, H. M. Hyndman, Prince Kropotkin and Bernard Shaw watched from a respectable distance as Burns and Graham charged the police cordon. They were promptly beaten to the ground and arrested. They decided to continue to seek maximum publicity for the affair, electing for trial by jury. Graham engaged Asquith to defend him in asserting the rights of free speech and free assembly (7). He and his wife also arranged for a number of prominent socialists and others to attend the court and support him (8). The charges of assult were dismissed but both men were convicted of unlawful assembly and sentenced to 6 weeks imprisonment.

On his return to parliament from prison, Graham was loudly acclaimed by the Irish benches. The Irish M.P.s appreciated his strong support for their cause and delighted in his unabashed defiance of the House of Commons. Graham's

scornful attitude towards the reverence usually accorded the House and all its ways was, after all, similar in some ways to the line pioneered by Parnell and Joseph Biggar in the obstruction tactics of the late 1870s. An article in United Ireland, which appeared in 1888 by its "Young Parliamentary Hand", pays a clear tribute to this side of Graham.

> From the beginning Cunninghame Graham was regarded as one of the most remarkable men in the new Parliament. His appearance alone singled him out from the ordinary run and ruck of new members who huddled (timidly) together in the lobbies of Westminster....
>
> If Cunninghame Graham had been content to call himself 'Mexican Jack' and to sport a sombrero, he would have obtained what the French call a succes fou, but he was a man with a mission, and languid London does not love men with missions. He was a Radical in the true sense of the term - a Radical with that touch of Quixotism without which few reforms would ever come to anything. He saw that there was work to be done, and he set himself to do it with the same fiery energy and indomitable determination which he had shown during his former travels in wild lands. He entered Parliament not to play the part of the silent member, but to plead vehemently for all the causes dearest to his heart. It is needless to say that he made himself at once amazingly unpopular with all the 'classes', with advocates of things as they are, and that if there was one individual whom the average Tory hated almost as much as any Irish member, it was the impetuous, red-haired Cunningham Graham (9).

In March 1888, a vacancy appeared in one of the other Lanarkshire constituencies. Stephen Mason, the Gladstonian member for Mid-Lanark, retired because of ill-health. James Keir Hardie, the Secretary of the Ayrshire Miners Union, decided to contest the seat. The Mid-Lanark by-election has become famous as the first occasion when an independent socialist stood for parliament. It is of interest here through the role that Hardie and his supporters believed the Irish community to have played in it.

Keir Hardie was well-known in the constituency, having worked as a miner and a miners' organiser in Lanarkshire. In this latter capacity he had had his brushes with the Irish. In 1879, welcoming the veteran miners' leader Alexander Macdonald at a mass meeting, he had compared Macdonald's work for the miners to that of "Luther at the rise of Protestantism". The comparison was intended, of course, as a compliment, but two-thirds of the audience were Irish Catholics and they objected strongly to it, and Hardie had to be protected from attack (10). Several years later he published a fierce attack on the Irish in the mines for sabotaging the Scots' efforts to keep up living standards by output restriction.

> Nothing angers the miner so much during a time of restriction than to find a fellow working at a stoop where the requisites are a big shovel, a strong back, and a weak brain, said fellow having a few weeks before been busy in a peat bog or a tatie field, but who is now producing coal enough for a man and a half, and ... to hear him say, 'Och, I'll fill as many as I loike' (11).

There was often friction between the Scots and Irish miners. Partly it was sectarian and partly economic. For the Irish had this reputation of strike-breaking, being imported by the coal-owners to counteract attempts at strikes or restrictions of output.

Like Graham, Hardie first entered politics as a Liberal. He saw the Liberals as the natural party for working-class radicals, and had worked, in the 1886 general election on behalf of Eugene Wason, the Liberal candidate for South Ayrshire. The campaign had been run almost entirely on the issue of Irish Home Rule. This had alienated many Scottish

miners in the constituency who were, as mentioned above, not enthusiastic about their Irish workmates, and Wason had been very narrowly defeated. Graham's championship of the 8 hour day for miners, and his efforts to introduce a measure to that effect in parliament had made him known to Hardie and the 2 soon became friends. Most Liberals, however, refused to support the idea, partly at least because the Lib-Lab miners' spokesmen in parliament opposed it. Hardie, infuriated at this, persuaded the miners of North Ayrshire to nominate him as their candidate for the seat for the next election. North Ayrshire's Liberal M.P. had joined the Liberal Unionists in 1885 and had been returned unopposed in 1886. The Gladstonian Liberals were therefore looking for a candidate. Graham tried to get the Liberal nomination for Hardie but the Association was annoyed by Hardie's remark that he would run anyway, whether adopted by them or not, and refused to consider him.

It was at this point that the Mid-Lanark vacancy appeared and Hardie transferred his interest there. Despite his experience at North Ayrshire he began by writing, on March 15 1888, to ask for the Liberal nomination. In his letter to the Association Chairman, Bailie Burt, he set out his political position, concluding:

> Personally I have all my life been a Radical of a somewhat advanced type, and from the first have supported Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule proposals (12).

Six days later, however, he wrote again, this time withdrawing his name, as:

> The Executive of the Association, without giving the

> electors a chance of deciding on the merits of the respective candidates, have already, at the instance of outsiders, and without regard to fitness, decided who the candidate is to be (13).

It was as the "Labour and Home Rule Candidate" that Hardie now declared himself. He had encouragement to stand independently from several prominent men of advanced views, notably Cunninghame Graham and H. H. Champion. Champion, a maverick socialist from an upper-class background, came north to run his campaign. Graham announced his support at a St. Patrick's Day Rally in Glasgow. As soon as the campaign got under way Hardie wrote to Champion: "Mining and Irish vote not less than 3,500. If these, especially the Irish, can be secured, the seat is ours" (14). When he had worked for Wason in 1886, the problem had been to get the Scots out to vote for a candidate they felt was standing only on a platform of Irish Home Rule. Now the position was reversed: Hardie had to try and draw Irish voters away from a Liberal who was making maximum advantage of Gladstone's commitment to Home Rule.

Champion went to Parnell to ask for his support for Hardie, and to try and make a general electoral bargain for the future. But, though he made his approach in the name of a "National Labour Party", no such organisation of course existed. Parnell was well aware of this and was, understandably, not interested in jeopardising his agreement with the Liberals by treating with a group who had nothing to offer in return. In any case, Parnell by this time was not particularly enthusiastic about British radicalism. Champion

came north without any official Irish blessing for Hardie, and though this must have been a disappointment, it can hardly have been a surprise to him.

Hardie did receive the support of the more advanced Irish. In particular, the support of Michael Davitt, who was on the platform at the meeting in Glasgow when Hardie announced his candidature. Davitt tried, without success, to persuade Parnell to change his mind, and also saw Schnadhorst to suggest that the local Liberals be pressed into taking Hardie as their man. He was equally unsuccessful here, Schnadhorst replying briskly that if the Liberals adopted Hardie, the Tories would win the seat (15).

Hardie also received the endorsement of John Ferguson, though Ferguson had his reservations:

> My opinion is still that it (i.e. Labour) should enter the Liberal Association and work through it. There is certainly an element of danger in two political organisations holding the same principles coming into collision (16).

Hardie, of course, would certainly have questioned Ferguson's belief in the "two political organisations holding the same principles". Ferguson's support was certainly valuable, but Hardie also looked for more formal Irish blessing, approaching the largest and most prestigious branch of the Irish National League in the west of Scotland, the "Home Government Branch":

> Knowing how wide are the sympathies of the members of your branch with the claims of the Democracy to parliamentary representation, and the wide influence which you justly exercise over your fellow Nationalists in Scotland, I venture to solicit your help in winning the Mid-Lanark election for Home Rule and Labour.

> I am no novice in either of these questions, and years ago was considered a dangerous fellow because I ventured in our Liberal association, to advocate the claims of Ireland to self government.
>
> My position now is this. Should I be returned to Parliament I will vote with the Irish party on all questions relating to Ireland, even though such vote should be against the Liberal Party. I would do so on the ground that Irishmen must know best what Ireland needs.
>
> In all other matters I am a democrat of a very advanced type, so much so that I would support every measure curtailing the power of Royalty, aristocracy, and snobocracy, with a view to their ultimate abolition.
>
> A resolution passed by your branch would strengthen my position very much with the Irish voters of Mid-Lanark (17).

This was a careful and judicious letter, in which Hardie flattered the branch and managed to play down his radicalism without actually disowning it. A fortnight later he wrote again to thank them "very cordially" for a resolution of support (18). In fact the situation was somewhat more complex. Officially the branch decided to follow I.N.L. policy and support the Liberal; it was a Fergusonite minority who had resolved to declare for Hardie. But Hardie continued to claim he had the backing of the branch and to thank them publicly for their support (19).

In any event it was not an endorsement from inside the constituency, and it was undermined by the advice of the overall Scottish organiser of the I.N.L., Owen Kiernan, to stick with the Liberal. Though Kiernan was by no means always popular with all the branches he represented, in this case he seems to have taken them with him. Even more influential was the opposition of the Irish newspaper, The

Glasgow Observer. It declared in an editorial that the priority must be Home Rule:

> We cannot afford, much as we would like to serve the interests of the workmen - if Mr. Hardie's return would be a gain to them, which we question - to throw in our lot with any new causes or new programmes. We want to settle Home Rule first (20).

Not only was Hardie at pains to stress his commitment to Irish Home Rule, he also showed that his ideas for the development of Labour owed much to the example of the Irish Parliamentary Party. In his manifesto he wrote:

> As the Irish have, by opposing them, forced the Liberals hastily to find 'political salvation' as to Home Rule, so we can, and will convert them to a belief in the direct representation of Labour, and the addition to their official programme of measures which will benefit the class to which you and I belong (21).

He must have felt less inspired and grateful when 3 members of the Irish party came up to speak for the Liberal. Presumably they came at the request of the Liberals, who must have felt that Hardie represented a serious threat. The Irish party produced J. Pinkerton, J. J. O'Kelly and T. D. Sullivan, respectively a Protestant, an old Fenian and a spokesman of the clerical interest, to appeal to all types of Irish voter. All 3 explained that a vote for Hardie was a vote against Gladstone and against Home Rule for Ireland.

Hardie's difficulties were not confined to the Nationalist Irish. His frequent reiterations of his support for Home Rule naturally did little for his chances among the Orange element in the constituency. Orangeism was particularly strong in the town of Wishaw and Hardie held an especially unhappy meeting there, at the end of which only half a dozen

hands were raised for the vote of confidence in him. The composition of this meeting was mostly Irish and some commentators have assumed that these opponents, as elsewhere, were Nationalists. Evidence that they were not lies in another letter of Hardie's to his supporters in the I.N.L. Home Government Branch in Glasgow. In it, he tried to explain that, in replying to a question at Wishaw, he had not disowned their support. In fact, he had used a technicality to evade the question, and it was highly unfortunate and embarrassing for him that his answer was reported back. Obviously, had his Wishaw audience been composed of Nationalists, there would have been no need to avoid the charge of I.N.L. support (22).

Hardie was badly defeated. The Liberal, Philipps, was elected, receiving 3847 votes. The Unionist got nearly 3000, and Hardie came at the bottom of the poll with 617; the "gallant six hundred" he called them. After the election he wrote again to the Home Government Branch:

> Kindly convey to the members ... my heartiest thanks for the support accorded by them to me during the recent election campaign. They have proved themselves the genuine friends of Ireland by endeavouring to make friends between the Democracies of the two countries, as only thus is Home Rule ever possible.
>
> They have also shown that with them Home Rule means more than a bit of sentiment, that it is after all only a means to an end - the end being the amelioration of the lot of the common people. I very much fear that Ireland's true battle will only begin after Home Rule has been granted as the conduct of certain 'leaders' on this occasion bodes ill for their future action when Land and Labour questions come up for discussion on College Green. Probably your countrymen at home may then learn who were their real friends in the Mid-Lanark contest, the Home Government Branch or the official leaders (23).

Davitt's response to the result, though less impassioned, was roughly similar:

> It would be better, I admit, ... not to divide Liberal constituencies now upon the issue of direct parliamentary representation.... But it is quite another thing to assail English or Scotch working-men with bitter abuse for daring to run an issue of their own across the path of Home Rule. It will be remembered by Scotch working-men (who were Home Rulers before Gladstone) that Irish M.P.s were sent from London to oppose the Labour candidate (24).

When Hardie had referred to himself as the "Labour and Home Rule" candidate, he was not only meaning Home Rule for Ireland. For Hardie too was a member of the Scottish Home Rule Association. His campaign had been endorsed by the S.H.R.A. in Edinburgh (25), and the young Secretary of the London committee of the S.H.R.A., James Ramsay MacDonald, wrote to Hardie, enclosing his committee's resolution of support:

> I cannot refrain from wishing you God-speed in your election contest. Had I been able to have gone to Mid-Lanark to help you - to do so both by 'word and deed' - would have given very great pleasure indeed. The powers of darkness - Scottish newspapers with English editors (as the 'Leader'), partisan wire-pullers, and the other etceteras of political squabbles - are leagued against us.
>
> But let the consequences be what they may, do not withdraw. The cause of Labour and of Scottish Nationality will suffer much thereby. Your defeat will awaken Scotland, and your victory will re-construct Scottish Liberalism. All success be yours, and the National cause you champion. There is no miner - and no other one for that matter - who is a Scotsman and not ashamed of it, who will vote against you in favour of an obscure English barrister, absolutely ignorant of Scotland and of Scottish affairs, and who only wants to get to Parliament in order that he may have the tail of M.P. to his name in the law courts (26).

Hardie was thus entirely sincere in his attachment to Home Rule, for both Ireland and Scotland; his commitment to Irish Home Rule was not simply a pragmatic response to Irish political power. As he and his supporters saw it, they had evoked no similar response from the Irish of Mid-Lanark: to put it crudely, their Scottish nationalism had foundered on the rock of Irish nationalism. He believed that the majority of the Irish voters of Mid-Lanark had been quite content to see the causes of Labour and Scottish nationalism sacrificed to preserve a Liberalism that they believed represented the only practical hope for Irish Home Rule.

Mid-Lanark made Keir Hardie famous. It established him as the foremost Labour spokesman for Scotland and, indeed, gave him a pre-eminent place in the whole of British Labour. By the time of the next general election, 1892, Hardie was to be offered the chance of running for Parliament for West Ham; a constituency, he believed correctly, he could win. Since he had done so badly very much on his home ground in Scotland, he accepted. The following year he helped to form the I.L.P. at its inaugural conference in Bradford and from then on his future as a British, rather than Scottish, Labour leader was assured. In the election of 1900 he was returned for Merthyr, the seat he was to be associated with for the rest of his life.

Hardie never abandoned the cause of Scottish Home Rule, but his transformation into a purely British Labour politician inevitably weakened its hold on him. Had he, on the other

hand, been a British leader with a strong and visible Scottish base, his faith in the Scottish national demand would surely have increased rather than diminished. At Mid-Lanark and over the next 4 years, when Hardie and Graham were campaigning regularly in the west of Scotland, the myth and image of the Irish voter was created by them to stand as scapegoat for their disappointments.

The point should be stressed that Hardie cannot have run all that well among native Scottish voters at Mid-Lanark, or his share of the vote would have been higher. There were, in general, reasons for the weakness of the Scottish Labour movement quite unconnected with the Irish. In particular Scottish Liberalism tended to be more radical than its English counterpart, and thus to keep the allegiance of much of the working-class longer, and to continue to be the centre for advanced ideas. It is also worth pointing out, on the question of nationalism that, with the rise of the S.T.U.C. in influence in the Labour movement in the 1890s, the interest in Scottish devolution declined rapidly (27). And, as we have seen, the Scottish Liberal party was turning to a belief in both Irish and Scottish Home Rule. The Irish voter therefore had the opportunity to support both causes by voting Liberal.

Hardie had concentrated much of his effort at Mid-Lanark on the Irish voters and he had started on the premiss that they were likely to be hostile. This belief was based on the difficulties he had had with Irish miners in the coalfields,

and on a certain residue of anti-Irish nativism. Having himself set them up as the greatest potential obstacle to success, it was natural for him to ascribe to them much of the blame for his defeat. The Irish leaders themselves encouraged this process by so firmly getting involved in the election. In fact, it is doubtful if the Irish were really so significant in the election. Insufficient work on voting patterns has been done to state with any degree of certainty that the division between native Scottish radical and immigrant Irishman, had any concrete existence. Two recent studies suggest that the Irish were electorally much less significant than was previously thought, and that many Irish were quite friendly towards Scottish radicalism (28).

The tendency to blame the Irish for electoral reversal was not confined to the Labour movement. The Liberals in Scotland were adept at it too, notably in 1885 and 1900 (29). But Hardie, Graham and their supporters developed it into a complete rationale, which came to be almost universally accepted inside the movement. In his memoirs of the early Scottish Labour movement, which doubled as an informal history, David Lowe wrote:

> At the very outset of my connection with public affairs, I was confronted with the Irish difficulty. Otherwise friendly Irishmen were against me for helping to build up a Labour Party, because among other reasons they thought that nothing should happen until Home Rule was passed. On that account I came to the conclusion that the Irish politicians required to be fought if Labour was to get a line on the poster in our time, and locally I acted accordingly. The suggested alliance of Nationalist and Labour forces in Parliament never seemed to me a matrimonial venture either romantic or sensible (30).

"The Irish difficulty" indeed, became at times almost a matter of celebration, a vehicle for the building up of the myths not only of the obscurantist Irishman but of the fearless and pioneering Graham and Hardie. The supreme illustration of this is an anecdote, retold by the biographers of both men, of a meeting in the Camalchie division of Glasgow in the early 1890s.

Graham was to introduce Hardie in a hall in the middle of a large Irish area. The Irish duly turned out in large numbers to howl down the Labour spokesmen, whose party they believed represented a threat to Home Rule. As soon as Graham appeared on the platform, "pandemonium broke loose". He retreated, instructed the attendants to lock the doors and returned clutching a dummy pistol he had found among the belongings of a theatrical company who were also using the hall. Flourishing the gun, he called for order, and then announced:

> I am going to speak for half an hour, and then I shall introduce my friend, Keir Hardie, and until he has finished his address not a man will interrupt him, or try to move, unless he wishes to be carried out of the hall as a corpse.

The audience, impressed by this display, applauded loudly and obediently listened to their speeches, in which they were careful to stress their belief in Home Rule. At the end of the meeting, again to much applause, Graham informed them of the harmless nature of the pistol (31).

In the aftermath of the Mid-Lanark election, Hardie called a meeting of those interested in the future of Labour. He

wrote to his friends in the I.N.L. Home Government Branch, inviting them to send representatives (32). The meeting was chaired by Cunninghame Graham. Graham was still nominally a Liberal M.P., but seems by this time to have decided to break completely with Liberalism. In an article just before Mid-Lanark he had asked provocatively: "Has the Liberal Party a Future?" He concluded that, as it stood, it had not. It had abandoned its concern for humanity, its social policy was non-existent, and it was becoming indistinguishable from the Tories. "The Capitalist Party", as he dubbed it, would need to change, and change more than it seemed prepared to do:

> No, if the Liberal party has a future, it must get rid of these nobodies, and show that it has no fear of modern thought; it must pledge itself to an Eight Hours Bill, institute a municipality for London, nationalise the land, and commence public works for the unemployed; and then, if it has good luck, it may regain the confidence of the democracy - that is to say, if some other party has not been beforehand in the field (33).

Just such another party Graham was now in the process of forming. The Glasgow meeting decided to launch a Scottish Labour Party and the inaugural conference was held in August 1888. Graham was elected President and Hardie Secretary. Much of the membership came from the land reformers and included Shaw Maxwell of the Land Restoration League and John Murdoch who had been the leader of the Crofters' movement. Article 5 of the new party's programme declared for "Home Rule for each separate nationality or country in the British Empire, with an Imperial Parliament for Imperial affairs" (34).

In accordance with this declaration, Graham spoke in the debate on Scottish Home Rule initiated by G. B. Clark in April 1889. He welcomed the proposal, though not "specially on nationalist grounds". He believed that Scotland would wish to have control of her own affairs to pass progressive legislation such as land reform and the 8 hour day.

> I believe, Sir, that there is a great and growing demand for Home Rule in Scotland, but it comes, in my opinion, from no sentimental grounds whatever, but from the extreme misery of a certain section of the Scottish population, and they wish to have their own members under their own hands, in order to extort legislation from them suitable to relieve the misery.

He concluded:

> It has been said (by Hunter, the seconder of the motion) that in the event of the institution of a Scottish Legislature we should largely be represented by the merchants of the country. To that statement I say, God forbid! (35).

We have seen how the Irish Nationalists at Westminster had their reservations about Scottish Home Rule, but also how they had some regard for Cunninghame Graham. In addition to this, a genuine friendship had grown up between Graham and Charles Stewart Parnell. In some ways, there is an obvious parallel between the 2 men. Both were aristocrats leading a democratic movement. The difference here, of course, was that Parnell had a large and very evident following, whereas Graham did not. As he wrote to John Burns:

> The House is beginning to find out that there is nothing and nobody behind me. Anyone but the idiots in Parliament would have seen this long ago ... (36).

Both men held parliament and its institutions in scornful contempt and wished to use it for their own purposes, rather than seeing it as an end in itself. Both were cordially

hated there, and if Parnell was the more hated, it was because he was the one with power.

The 2 met when Graham, as a new member, sat in Parnell's seat in the Commons and returned a brisk answer to an outraged Irish M.P. who tried to move him. "Quite right, the seats are free" remarked Parnell mildly, arriving quietly as the dispute was in progress. It was, one imagines, just the kind of gesture Parnell would appreciate provided, of course, that it was not one of his own Irish members who made it. The best of the stories about them recounts how Parnell commented enviously on Graham's ability to quote poetry in his parliamentary speeches. Graham immediately asked him the subject of his next planned speech and produced several apposite quotations. Parnell endeavoured to learn them by heart but forgetting some and misquoting the rest, succeeded only in muddling his speech. Meeting Graham after the debate he swore that he would never repeat the experiment. Sadly, the story is told by Graham's most romantic and inaccurate biographer, but if it is not true, it deserves to be (37). Graham himself recounted how people would see him and Parnell deep in discussion and imagine they were planning some political manoeuvre. In fact, they talked about horses, a topic on which Graham afterwards remarked, Parnell "knew little".

On a more serious level, it was in a sense true that horses were one of the few subjects that they had in common. For, though they were united in attitude to parliament, they had

a very different approach to politics. Graham's extreme democratic position precluded belief in the value of strong leadership. Parnell was a leader par excellence, a leader who demanded total loyalty from his followers and who had little faith in "the democracy". It was in this sense that Graham would later write an article attacking "Parnellism". "No man can be a Socialist and also be a Parnell - a really democratic movement excludes the character.... Rightly considered, the leader is no more valuable than the camp follower ..." he wrote in 1893, in a warning to the newly-founded I.L.P. Any personality cult was to be avoided (38).

When he wrote that article, Graham was out of parliament. In the Commons, his regard for Parnell was really awakened by the O'Shea divorce case. The disowning of Parnell by the Liberals, and by the majority of his own party, following the revelation of his adultery with Mrs. O'Shea was exactly the kind of thing that roused Graham to fury. In it he saw the epitome of the hypocrisy that he so hated, and in an open letter of January 25 1890, he attacked with venom.

> Yes, I know. 'Thou shalt not commit adultery'. That is to say: Thou shalt not be found out committing adultery. Now, I do not express any opinion on the Parnell-O'Shea case. I have no opinion to express, and if I had one, should not express it. I neither know nor care whether Mrs. O'Shea was Mr. Parnell's mistress or not. What can it matter to me? Still less, what can it matter to the cause of Home Rule for Ireland? I hear that amongst the ranks of the 'unco' guid', an attempt will be made to damage his political reputation through the aspersion on his private character.
>
> ... There are crimes that warrant the public in withdrawing all confidence from the man who commits them. There are actions - actions considered, I am well aware perfectly legitimate on the Stock Exchange and in the office - that should be sufficient to hunt a man from

> public life. Is this one of them? I say, 'no'. It seems to me that the offence charged against Mr. Parnell is merely the offence of being found out. That is to say, if he has been found out, for of that we know nothing yet. Look round the House of Commons, look at the well-fed, idle rich men in it, and then ask me to believe that they are all earnest practisers of social purity. If this is so, and if the public knows that even St. Stephen's harbours a fair proportion of offenders against the Seventh Commandment, and knowing, tolerates them because they have not been the objectives of public scandal; why, therefore, this tone amongst so many Liberal papers of affecting to treat Mr. Parnell as a criminal? Had he been an obscure member of the Irish Party, some McHafferty, or O'Rafferty, or some member for Ballyshaughuttery, is one to suppose anyone would have cared a farthing? It is because on the Liberal posterior the imprint of the Parnellite boot is so clearly to be traced, even without the aid of smoked glass, that this freezing tone has come over so many of his quondam allies, assuming for the sake of argument the O'Shea thesis.
>
> ... The thing is ridiculous in a state of society in which marriage itself is too often a clerical-absolved prostitution, ... a society in which every day we see mothers eager to marry their youngest and fairest to old, painted, padded, lecherous baboons, simply because they have rank or wealth. If the Liberals are to banish and the Tories are to persecute Mr. Parnell for his alleged connection with Mrs. O'Shea what are we to do with H, and S, and Z, and all the others whom we know are guilty of similar offences? Let us form a huge Vigilance Committee, and whilst the bulk of the population are delivered over to long hours and low wages, let us leave the consideration of such matters to fools, and let us, as practical men and women, turn our attention to practical matters - such as the one I have been writing on (39).

Graham was, of course, on very shaky ground in doubting the allegations against Parnell, but this does not invalidate his general point. It was quite in character that he should seek to make some generally socialist observations during his attack on hypocrisy.

Always fond of the dramatic gesture, and to underline his support Graham, arriving late one day at the Commons, stopped on his way to his seat to shake Parnell's hand in front of

all the House. When Parnell died at the end of 1891, exhausted by his efforts to rebuild his position in Ireland, Graham was the only non-Irish M.P. to go to the station in London to pay his last respects as the body left for Ireland. Fifteen years later, he published his sketch "A Memory of Parnell" in the volume His People. It was one of his best pieces, and a moving and loving tribute to his friend. Quoted below are some short paragraphs from it:

> The party leaders feared and hated him, for he despised them, and his outlook on politics seemed but to point out all their lack of strength and incapacity. Gladstone, who though in talk fifty years, never contrived to say a single thing either original or worth remembering, was over-balanced by him, and Salisbury looked on him as Turk looks at a native Christian who rebels ...
>
> No-one, I think, was ever hated by the House as was Parnell, and he returned its hate a hundredfold, taking delight in gibing at it and making it absurd.
>
> No-one, I think, since Oliver the Great and Good (I write for the mere Englishry), has made the House of Commons tremble to its cowardly depths, as did Parnell, and never Irishman before or since his time, if we except Hugh Roe O'Neill, has ever treated, upon equal terms, with the old English foe.
>
> Let him sleep well, a Protestant amongst the serried graves of those who lie looking towards Rome, whilst they await the Trumpet's call. A Saxon leader of a Celtic race, a man who, though no orator, yet held enthralled a parliament that lives on talk. Well may his spirit hover hesitatingly between the towers of Westminster, where he enforced respect, and the grey columns upon College Green, the unfaithful Mecca, which he never lived to reach (40).

The Parnell of his last year of life was the Parnell Graham loved. His struggles to rebuild his position and his newly rediscovered contempt for the Liberals both appealed to Graham's romantic nature and Graham's vision of politics. It was as a threat to the British political system, as much

as the champions of devolution, that Graham admired the Irish party. He kept up his belief in Home Rule for Ireland but after the death of Parnell his interest in the subject sagged.

In any event, this stage of Graham's political career was closing. His last speech in the Commons, appropriately enough, was a eulogy on Parnell. During the debate on the Address in February 1892, the House was paying tribute to the Duke of Clarence and to W. H. Smith, both of whom had recently died. Graham reminded them:

> But there was one man who used to sit upon these benches, whose death I personally deplore more than that of either of the men I have mentioned - I refer to the late Mr. Charles Stewart Parnell. He was human, like the rest of us. He had his faults, as we all have; but when time has blotted out his faults, and when his qualities, which I consider great undoubtedly, have been more clearly discerned, when the present unhappy dissensions among the Irish Party have been removed, as they will be removed some day, the present generation will undoubtedly say that a most remarkable man, whom those in this House, if they did not all respect, very largely feared, has been taken from us; a man with whom I myself was acquainted on terms of friendship, and whose death, under the unfortunate circumstances which occurred, I shall always deplore, as having deprived this House of the most remarkable man who sat in it in this century (41).

Graham entered the 1892 general election as the S.L.P. candidate for Glasgow Camlachie. In all, the party was running 5 candidates. The party, like so many infant Labour organisations, had suffered from internal dissension. Hardie had quarrelled with Champion, who had left to form his own organisation in Aberdeen, and then with Chisholm Robertson, the influential leader of the Stirlingshire miners. The S.L.P. had also lost the support of the advanced

Irish, who had initially been friendly. At the inaugural conference, a letter of support had been read out from Michael Davitt and John Ferguson had been elected Vice-President. Ferguson, however, had resigned in 1890, declaring that he now believed the Labour campaigners to represent a threat to Irish Home Rule (42). Ferguson had followed Davitt's line in opposing Parnell after the divorce crisis: probably Graham's extravagant support for Parnell was largely responsible for his defection from the S.L.P. Davitt himself, who was standing as an anti-Parnellite for North Meath in the 1892 election, now described Graham and Hardie as merely a "faction" and wrote in his diary: "I believe Keir Hardie and Co. are secret enemies of the Home Rule cause" (43).

All of the S.L.P.'s candidates were unsuccessful. Despite his outspokeness, Graham could probably have had the Liberal nomination for Camlachie, but he felt that to take it would have compromised his principles, and he refused to meet Campbell-Bannerman who Gladstone had asked to arbitrate. He came third in the poll, gaining enough votes to enable a Liberal Unionist to win the seat (44). Hardie, as related above, was returned for West Ham.

Graham never went back to parliament. Henry Labouchere later wrote to him: "When are you coming back to the House? We miss you there" (45). It was quite possible that Labouchere did miss him, but very doubtful if the rest of the Commons did, except as an exotic adjunct to the parlia-

mentary scene. His political interests were shifting: after 1892 he became much less interested in domestic affairs, turning his formidable energies towards foreign policy and imperial questions. The S.L.P. never recovered from the 1892 general election. It affiliated to the I.L.P. when that party was founded and was wound up at the end of 1894. Earlier in that year Graham had received an invitation to stand for the party in Edinburgh Central. The invitation came from the Branch Secretary, James Connolly, the future Irish socialist and nationalist leader. Graham's refusal of this offer was firm but friendly in tone:

> ... Many thanks for asking me to stand. However, I have no money, I am sorry to say, and this is the third or fourth offer I have been obliged to decline. Even if anybody paid for me (which is a thing I think I might get done) I could only attend the 'Den of Thieves' now and then as my affairs are in a bad way ... On re-reading your letter, I see you have an election fund. Under these circumstances I could not accept such a sacrifice from you. I am not a working man and I could not accept such a sacrifice from you ... Pray thank the Branch very much for me and say that I am very sensible of the high compliment they pay me, but though much as I would like a fight, I do not see my way to enter it on account of want of funds, and I cannot, and will not, be a burden to anyone. Please say that I will do my best to help anyone else who may be selected ... (46).

Graham had always believed that Labour would be best represented by working-class candidates, and it was for that reason that he always supported Hardie so strongly. His advice to Connolly was that, if they had money, they should use it to back such a candidate. His claim that "my affairs are in a bad way" was certainly true. His father had left him an inheritance burdened with debt and after trying to cope with it for many years, he was eventually forced to sell his Gartmore estate in Perthshire in 1900.

The following year, 1895, he published his first book: Notes on the District of Menteith. His career had entered a new phase, that of a writer of travel, history, short stories and sketches. He did continue to write occasionally for the left-wing press. In 1894, for example, he published an article in Keir Hardie's Labour Leader entitled "High Water Mark". It was an attack on the Liberals, similar to the 1888 Contemporary Review article. The Liberals he argued had reached and passed their high water mark; they showed no intention of implementing the 1891 Newcastle Programme and had even, following the failure of the second Bill, abandoned Irish Home Rule. It is interesting to find, in the next number of the Labour Leader presumably by Hardie, an article on another by-election at Mid-Lanark. Hardie's successor as Labour candidate there was Robert Smillie, and he too had come bottom of the poll. The article followed the established line in ascribing this to Michael Davitt, who had spoken for the Liberal:

> He has kept Mid-Lanark for Liberalism as against Labour, but at a cost to himself which the future will reveal. Men who stood by him in the dark days of the Irish movement were hard to convince that he too had turned apostate to Labour. Now the matter is placed beyond dispute. He is a party hack with the best of them (47).

Cunninghame Graham's sketches and tales appeared, for the most part, in the Saturday Review. Having lost the editorship of the Fortnightly Review at the end of 1894, Frank Harris had bought the Saturday, which he edited for 5 years. The Saturday had been a Tory periodical but Harris moved it behind advanced Liberalism. He recruited several new

authors including Graham and Arthur Symons (48). When Harris relinquished control in 1899, the paper reverted to an orthodox Tory line, but kept Graham on as a contributor. He held a sort of privileged position on the paper, bombarding it with letters in the intervals between his articles and reviews.

Most of his contributions reflected his increasing distaste for imperialism. In 1896, for example, he published a 2 part article on the Jameson Raid and British policy in South Africa: "Fraudesia Magan". He was deeply opposed to the Boer War, though he had only limited sympathy for the Boers, who he described in another article as "a race of pious Dutchmen, who thought, as Scotchmen think, that God himself professed a special interest in their welfare" (49). Graham was ahead of his time in identifying the blacks as the real losers in the South African question.

Much of what he wrote for the Saturday Review was not directly political but literary, though the distinction was never an absolute one in Graham's writings. He was conscious, as any Scottish author of the period had to be, of the work of the Kailyard school of novelists, those purveyors of pictures of an idealised and sentimentalised Scotland. Graham disliked their false view of his native land:

> Verily I believe there is not a henwife, weaver, idiot, elder, or ploughman in this conglomerate of granite, pudding-stone, and peat moss known as Scotland who would recognise himself in the dress in which the British public has been eager to welcome him. Neither

> would I have England believe is the entire Scottish nation composed of ministers, elders and precentors (50).

He was not unaware of the lure of such works; as he wrote to Edward Garnett:

> In dealing with Scotland and things Scotch, one should avoid sentiment, it destroyed those awful McCrocketts and Larnes, and is a snare to the pious chanting, hypocritical, hard, but at the same time sentimental, and whisky loving Scotchman. I am a Scotchman (51).

In his own Scottish stories, for example the fine Beattock for Moffat, he succeeded in showing this mixture of sentiment and harshness that he believed encapsulated the Scottish character.

Graham's work for the Saturday Review renewed his contacts with George Bernard Shaw who he had got to know through the socialist movement. Shaw had been engaged by Harris as the theatre critic of the magazine. Graham knew both Shaw and Oscar Wilde, those 2 quintessential London Irishmen who coloured and filtered so many late nineteenth century attitudes to Ireland, and knew them better than many who claimed to be their friends.

Harris related how, in the early days of his editorship of the Saturday, he commissioned 3 articles on William Morris, who had died suddenly. Shaw was to write on Morris as a socialist and prose writer, Arthur Symons on his poetry and Graham on Morris' funeral.

> When they arrived I found that Symons was very good indeed and so was Shaw; but Cunninghame-Graham (sic) had written a little masterpiece, a gem of restrained yet passionate feeling; absolute realistic description lifted to greatness by profound poetry. Shaw too was overwhelmed with admiration of Graham's story.

> 'An amateur of genius', I praised, 'it's a pity he hasn't to earn his living by his pen'.
>
> 'A good thing for us', cried Shaw; 'he'd wipe the floor with us all if he often wrote like that' (52).

The trouble with this story is that Harris' unreliability is legendary. There is, however, other evidence that Shaw did admire Graham's work. He also used Graham in his own work. He took his statement to the Speaker of the House of Commons during an acrimonious exchange - "I never withdraw" - and made it the "cockade" of Saranoff, the Bulgarian hero of Arms and the Man. Incidentally, Saranoff's foil in the play, the Swiss Bluntschli, was modelled on Sidney Webb (53).

> I have been studying your works so devoutly that I find myself unable to resist stealing the mise en scene of Mogreb el Acksa .... It is a sublime work; but there are one or two things that I have been unable to divine. Would you mind helping an unfortunate plagiarist out by jotting down a few curt answers under the enclosed sheets of questions.

Thus Shaw wrote to Graham while working on his play Captain Brassbound's Conversion (54). Mogreb el Acksa was an account Graham had written of a journey in Morocco. Shaw enclosed 5 pages of questions about the country and the manners and dress appropriate to a Scottish missionary there. Graham dutifully replied, though Shaw complained that he had changed his attitude towards the missionaries since writing his own book:

> Unluckily, in his Mogreb el Acksa, which delighted me so much that I stole it for the play, he gives a very sympathetic account of the Scotch missionaries. I depicted my missionary accordingly; but when I wrote to him for instructions as to how he should be dressed etc, lo! R.B. was in his most sardonic mood, and sent me a frightful and derisive figure in paper collar, reach-me-down tourists' check etc, very amusing, but utterly unsuited to my Vicar of Wakefield (55).

Shaw managed to reconcile the differences in creating Rankin, the missionary, and in "Notes to Captain Brassbound's Conversion; Sources of the Play" put in a tribute to his friend.

> Cunninghame Graham is the hero of his own book; but I have not made him the hero of my play, because so incredible a personage must have destroyed its likelihood - such as it is. There are moments when I do not myself believe in his existence. And yet he must be real; for I have seen him with these eyes; and I am one of the few men living who can decipher the curious alphabet in which he writes his private letters. The man is on public record too .... Yet his getting out of prison was as nothing compared to his getting into the House of Commons. How he did it I know not; but the thing certainly happened, somehow. That he made pregnant utterances as a legislator may be taken as proved by the keen philosophy of the travels and tales he has since tossed to us; but the House, strong in stupidity, did not understand him until in an inspired moment he voiced a universal impulse by bluntly damning its hypocrisy. Of all the eloquence of that silly parliament, there remains only one single damn ... He is a fascinating mystery to a sedentary person like myself. The horse, a dangerous animal whom, when I cannot avoid, I propitiate with apples and sugar, he bestrides and dominates fearlessly, yet with a true republican sense of the rights of the four-legged fellow-creature whose martyrdom, and man's shame therein, he has told most powerfully in his Cavalry, a tale with an edge that will cut the soft cruel hearts and strike fire from the hard kind ones. He handles the other lethal weapons as familiarly as the pen: medieval sword and modern Mauser are to him as umbrellas and kodaks are to me .... He is, I understand, a Spanish hidalgo .... He is, I know, a Scotch laird. How he contrives to be authentically the two things at the same time is no more intelligible to me than the fact that everything that has ever happened to him seems to have happened in Paraguay or Texas instead of in Spain or Scotland. He is, I regret to add, an impenitent and unashamed dandy: ... (56).

Writing to Shaw about this portrait of him, Graham remarked, apropos of this last remark: "To live up to your biography of me, I shall have to ruin myself in hats and boots" (57).

There is a certain mocking edge to this portrait. The 2 men held differing views as to how the Labour movement should

develop, though they had often shared the same platform. Graham disapproved of the Fabians and their policy of permeation of Liberalism: with his deep contempt for the Liberal party, he saw the way forward as resting with the new Unionism and independent socialist representation. Shaw, like many others, found Graham difficult to take seriously as a political prophet: at bottom the only Graham he could come to terms with was the exotic dandy dancing on the fringes of reality, the Graham of Mogreb el Acksa. Recalling the Saturday in Harris' time, Shaw wrote, with gentle venom, "Cunninghame Graham was a socialist, militant to his spurs" (58).

On the other side, Graham enjoyed Shaw's plays but believed them to be devoid of real depth of feeling. He wrote to Edward Garnett of Man and Superman: "The fact is his plays are plays for eunuchs, and his horrid anti-sexual, irrational and vicious view is the view of an eunuch" (59). He was horrified by Saint Joan: "I never thought to see a simple, beautiful story so vulgarised and made common.... Shaw, to my mind, saw (and felt) nothing, and out of the most beautiful story, has made a cultured Irish Protestant farce" (60). But the 2 remained friends despite, or perhaps because of, their inability to take each other entirely seriously. They did at least share a half contemptuous and half amused attitude to the English.

Oscar Wilde Graham got to know during his years in London. Graham would frequently go to the Cafe Royal to dine with

Wilde after a day in parliament. Wilde had been present at Bow St., after Trafalgar Square, to show support for the 2 rebels. The friendship between Wilde and Graham is shown by a postscript to a letter of Wilde's to Gabriella Graham: "Give my love to your delightful and dangerous husband" (61). It could have served as an epitaph to Graham that he would have appreciated. As was the case with Parnell, it was when the outraged morality of England was in full cry against Wilde, that Graham championed his friend. Again, he saw only hypocrisy and the small-minded vengeance of the mediocre against a great man. He was, nonetheless, irritated by Wilde's inaction and, as he saw it, weakness, when disaster overtook him:

> Courage, he has no courage at all. There were three things & three only he could have done
>
> 1. Commit suicide.
>
> 2. Take the train to San Sebastian (where there is no extradition treaty).
>
> 3. Stand up in the dock & defy the world & say (if he thought so) he had done no wrong, & that the Judge, the jury, the court & everyone were hypocrites (62).

What he was demanding was that Wilde should have acted as he would have done himself. Despite number one above, one can surely discount Tschiffely's story of Wilde stopping Graham on his morning ride to ask "What am I to do?". "Shoot yourself" replied Graham promptly, whereat Wilde broke down and sobbed that he knew he should but he lacked the courage (63). Whatever he may have believed and expressed privately, Graham had more compassion than to taunt his friend. In any event, his irritation with Wilde

changed quickly to pity: writing to the same correspondent a few days after the letter just quoted, he said:

> Poor Oscar, one cannot help being very sorry for him. He seems a kind hearted and generous fool and a mere baby in the ways of the world (64).

After Wilde's second trial and conviction Graham wrote:

> ... The judge was indeed both cowardly and cruel on the occasion of poor Oscar.... What I want to know is if Oscar is so great a criminal, why are not the people prosecuted whose names the judges know, as they were written to them? (65).

When Wilde was released from prison and went to live in France, and his Ballad of Reading Gaol was published, Graham wrote to him to congratulate him on it. Wilde replied:

> A thousand thanks for your charming letter, and its generous, and most welcome praise of the Ballad ... (66).

Since his own experiences after Trafalgar Square, Graham always felt a special sympathy for anyone who was imprisoned and Wilde's evocation of the horrors of prison life produced a warmly sympathetic response.

In 1905, 5 years after his death, Wilde's De Profundis appeared, albeit in a somewhat truncated form. Graham asked to review it for the Saturday Review, and used the occasion to pay his tribute to a friend who he believed had suffered more than his faults had ever deserved. The article was published under the heading "Vox Clamantis" and began:

> I knew him and admired his gifts. Most people now recall his wit, his humour, brilliancy, his poetry, his prose, his errors, triumphs and his fall. I most remember his great kindliness. It is the greatest quality in man.

He described how Wilde had none of the usual things to sustain him in prison, not even the thought of a home to go to afterwards; how Wilde felt that he was more a ridiculous character than a tragic one; and how, nonetheless "by degree he learned to bear it all". He reverses his earlier, harsher judgement in saying: "There was about the man a curious courage". He fixed on the event that has horrified many who have written about Wilde:

> One reads with indignation how he stood soaking in the rain, handcuffed and dressed in prison clothes, whilst a mob jeered him at a railway station. Had he been twice as guilty as he was and of a serious crime as cheating or the like, or cruelty, human respect should not have been thus outraged, for the man condemned by law is surely sacred, as we have taken from him all means of defence.

He asserts that Wilde's place in literature was assured: " ... when the paltry politician ... is long forgotten, the unhonoured poet in his dishonoured grave will be remembered, and his works read by every man of taste". Graham concluded the article with an appeal for Wilde to be returned to the place he deserved:

> His joy of life, and all the sufferings which to such a man those two fell years must have entailed, speak for him to us, asking us now, after his death to pardon, and when we speak of him, to call him by his name, to make no mystery of his fall, and to regard him as a star which looking at its own reflection in some dank marsh, fell down and smirched itself, and then became extinct ere it had time to soar aloft again (67).

If there is a note of implied criticism here, it was nonetheless a tribute of affection, and of kindliness, "the greatest quality in man". It certainly compared favourably with the attacks on Wilde that were still appearing in much of the press.

In 1908 Graham wrote to the Saturday Review to protest that they had failed to mention Keir Hardie as one of the defeated candidates in a report on the Glasgow University Rectorial Election. A group of socialist students had nominated Hardie, who came bottom of the poll behind Lord Curzon and Lloyd George. Graham had gone to Glasgow to speak for Hardie, whose campaign had been managed by Tom Johnston (68). Hardie and Graham had remained friends in the years since they had worked so closely together in Scotland, though their paths had diverged. Hardie had served as M.P. for West Ham from 1892 to 1895, when he lost the seat. He failed to get back to parliament at a by-election in East Bradford in 1896, but was elected for Merthyr Tydfil in 1900, the seat he held until his death.

Hardie and Graham co-operated again in 1913, in support of the Irish trade union leader James Larkin during the long and bitter Dublin Lock-Out. Larkin was a flamboyant and energetic union organiser, as brilliant at inspiring and leading workers as he was bad at the details and running of a union. His demands for improvement of the appalling pay and conditions of the Dublin dockers and tramwaymen led to a lock-out by a powerful group of employers, determined to destroy Larkin and his Irish Transport and General Workers Union. The employers were led by William Martin Murphy, a prominent Dublin businessman and nationalist M.P., and the dispute lasted for nearly a year, becoming increasingly violent and bitter. For a time it diverted attention away from the crisis over the third Home Rule Bill and many

advanced nationalists and intellectuals condemned Murphy's intransigent and arrogant attitude and supported Larkin. But Larkin realised that, to succeed, he needed practical support and money from trade unionists and Labour leaders in Britain. Partly because of his own high-handed manner, he did not receive this help to any sufficient degree and, in the end, the employers won the battle. Larkin's methods, however, had widely publicised the workers' grievances and, in the long term, the victory belonged to him.

Hardie went over to Dublin in September 1913 to give his support. Larkin was at the time in prison for seditious libel and Hardie concentrated his speeches on attacking the imprisonment as an attack on trade union freedoms. "There never was a meeting held in connection with a strike or a Labour dispute in which the same charge could not have held good", he said, and declared it was the duty of the British movement to resist "a conspiracy to destroy the Trade Union movement" (69). He saw James Connolly, who was in charge of the strike while Larkin was in prison, and then went on to Belfast to appeal for help for the strike. On his release from prison Larkin came over to Britain to ask for assistance. Increasingly irritated by the lack of enthusiasm of many union leaders, he embarked on a speaking tour of large towns and cities to whip up support directly from the working-class. On the evening of December 10, he spoke in Glasgow in the City Hall. Tom Johnston took the chair before an audience of between 3 and 4 thousand and Graham was on the platform. Larkin was received with "wild

enthusiasm" and a resolution of support was passed. After Larkin had made a dramatic and effective speech, Cunninghame Graham spoke.

> It was a bitter commentary upon the Home Rule question - he said that as one who for many years had voted for Home Rule ... he repeated that it gave food for reflection to think that the very men who were oppressing the women and the children of Dublin were mainly nationalists. The arch-opponent of Larkinism was not only a pious Catholic, but he sat in the House ... and voted for Home Rule with a regularity that would have shamed an Apostle. He knew that man did not live by bread alone, and that the legitimate sentiment of a nation was to be complied with and considered. But, after all, man must have a little bread, as well as sunbursts, and green flags and Brian Boru and the Celtic movements. Those things did not put bread into the bellies of the children, and did not feed the mothers or put clothes upon their backs. Therefore, Home Rule that merely expended itself in keeping Liberal majorities in power, in green flags, and Celtic renaissances was as a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal (70).

Larkin, with his fighting determination never to give in until the battle was completely lost, was just the sort of leader to appeal to Graham. It was because Larkin was getting so little support from the more cautious official British trade union leaders, that Graham made the effort to speak for him. For in general Graham took no part in Labour politics and had become deeply critical of the leaders of the Labour movement. He believed that they had allowed themselves to be sucked into the structure of political life and had come to treat the status quo with deference. From these strictures his friend Hardie was virtually the only leader to escape. Wilfrid Scawen Blunt recorded a conversation he had with Graham about Egypt and Morocco in 1908:

> I asked him to get our Labour members to move in matters of this sort, but he tells me they are a hopeless lot. When they get into Parliament they are at once bitten with the absurd idea that they are no longer to be working men, but statesmen, and they try to behave as such. 'I tell them', said Graham, 'that they would do more good if they came to the House in a body drunk and tumbling about on the floor' (71).

Graham's speech in Larkin's support showed that he saw the lock-out as a classic illustration of what he and Hardie had always maintained: that pure nationalism in Ireland would not benefit the working class. He had always hoped for a uniting of nationalism and socialism in both Ireland and Scotland. He felt too that the Irish Party, like the Labour Party, had lost its irreverent fighting approach towards Westminster that, as he said in the speech, "Home Rule merely expended itself in keeping Liberal majorities in power". He had become very dismissive and cynical over the state of Irish nationalism and the whole battle for Home Rule. In July 1914 he wrote to an old Glasgow friend:

> Politics seem cheerful, which of the two Irish armies do you think will have the prettiest uniform? Asquith, Law, Carson & Redmond are in the most ridiculous and laughable position four men ever were in. None of them, of course, ever had an idea of fighting, and for two years each and all of them have done nothing but jaw about Civil War when they knew there was no idea of it (72).

His uncomplimentary asides on "Brian Boru and the Celtic movements" and "Celtic renaissances" in the Glasgow speech seem rather surprising. Graham was after all a writer himself and one would not expect him to be dismissive of an important literary movement, indeed probably the most important literary movement of the time. It appears, however, that he was not an admirer of the Celtic

renaissance, either in Ireland or Scotland. The only other reference to the subject traced denies the universality of Celtic works and describes them as "openly" for Celtic consumption only (73). In addition, he may have felt particularly unenthusiastic in 1913 because W. B. Yeats had just refused a play Graham had sent him for the Abbey Theatre.

The play was Santiago Rusinol's La Verge del Mar, which Graham had translated from Catalan. It concerned some villagers who retrieve a wooden figure from the sea, which they believe to be a statue of the Virgin Mary. Apparent miracles are attributed to it and then a ship's captain recognises it as the figurehead of his wrecked ship, a figurehead modelled not on the Virgin but on his Muslim mistress. Eventually he is persuaded, by another apparent miracle, to say nothing. Graham sent his translation, under the title The Madonna of the Sea to Yeats, who wrote back rejecting it. Yeats criticised the play artistically for its lack of one dominating part and its lack of dramatic suspense and surprise. But it was most probably the beginning of his letter that would have annoyed Graham:

> I have read the little Spanish play. It interests me very much but would, I think, be a dangerous play for a theatre managed by Protestants for a largely Catholic audience (74).

Yeats was by no means frightened of putting on a "dangerous" play; presumably he did not think this was a good enough play to justify the outcry it would cause.

The 4 years of the First World War brought about a marked change in Cunninghame Graham's political outlook. With the death of his friend Keir Hardie in 1915, his last link with the Labour movement was severed (75). He moved sharply to the right, volunteering for war service (76), and then standing, unsuccessfully, for parliament in the 1918 election as a Liberal. His campaign in West Stirlingshire was marked by unpleasantly jingoistic attacks on the Labour candidate, his former friend Tom Johnston who had been a conscientious objector (77). From 1920 until his death in 1936 he devoted his political energies to Scottish nationalism, becoming the first President of the newly formed Scottish National Party in 1934.

His work and speeches for Scottish nationalism made virtually no reference to the Irish experience. He told his fellow nationalist Compton Mackenzie that he hoped the Scots would not need to wait for Home Rule as long as the Irish had. For the delay in granting Home Rule to Ireland had led to the Irish desiring too large a separation from Britain and had destroyed Ireland's affection for the Empire (78). This was a far cry from the Graham of 1885 to 1914, who had seen the natural development of the Celtic nations as lying in the building of an alliance of nationalism and socialism. He had seen the 2 beliefs as complementary, united by their intrinsic opposition to the established British state. He and Hardie had been ultimately disappointed by Irish nationalism. They found its proponents, both in Parliament and in the Irish community in Scotland, too

single-minded in their desire for Home Rule alone, too socially conservative, and too ready to use the existing political system to further their ends. Out of this disappointment the myth of the Irish immigrant as the greatest obstacle to the creation of an independent and truly radical Scotland had been born.

CHAPTER 5: THE SAGE OF DALMENY: ROSEBERY AND LIBERAL IMPERIALISM

> A man who never missed an occasion to let slip an opportunity.
>
> George Bernard Shaw on Lord Rosebery

The chapters on Scottish Home Rule dealt with the radical wing of Scottish Liberalism. Their enthusiasm for Scottish Home Rule is to be seen in the context of Irish Home Rule, which remained a constant objective, a fixed point, to them. There was another side to Scottish Liberalism: a grouping to the right of the party that came increasingly to reject the premiss of Irish Home Rule.

This group centred on Archibald Philip Primrose, 5th. Earl of Rosebery. Rosebery was twice Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister 1894-95. He emerged into national prominence as the brilliant organiser of Gladstone's first Midlothian campaign in 1879, and remained amongst the Liberal leaders until 1905. Those amongst the Scottish Liberals who at various times looked to his leadership included Richard Burdon Haldane, Ronald Munro Ferguson, Sir Thomas Gibson-Carmichael, Sir Thomas Glen-Coats, Charles M. Douglas and Charles Cooper of The Scotsman (1).

Rosebery was born in 1847. His father died 3 years later, and he succeeded his grandfather to the title at the age of 21 in 1868. This was important for his political career, for it meant that he had a seat in the Lords from the time when he first became interested in politics. This removed him from the mainstream of Liberal politics in 2 ways. He

never had the constraints of elected office on him, no constituents to appease and no whips to obey. If he became discouraged by the turn of events he could, and did, leave politics for months at a time to travel. Yet, with an automatic parliamentary seat, it was difficult for his opponents to claim that he had disallowed himself for office: he was always available to serve as a minister.

Secondly, the Liberal group in the Lords was small. When he was Prime Minister he led only some 30 or 40 peers. The force of Liberalism was concentrated in the Commons. While Salisbury could reasonably lead a government from the Lords, Rosebery looked faintly ridiculous with his little band of followers. He had also to rely on others for information on the daily dealings of the Commons. This was unsatisfactory for a Prime Minister in any event, but even more so for Rosebery who did not get on well with his Commons leader Sir William Vernon Harcourt.

Rosebery tried to get round this problem by asking his acolytes in the Commons, principally Haldane and Munro Ferguson, to keep him informed. Indeed, throughout his life Rosebery encouraged his supporters and acquaintances to write to him with any kind of information that concerned the political scene. He had a particularly good army of sources in the 1870s and 1880s from Scotland: politicians, political organiser, lawyers, university men. After 1895, to take another example, Thomas Wemyss Reid of The Speaker and R. W. Perks M.P. provided him with the current political preoccupations and gossip.

Rosebery found so many people prepared to send him information and promote his ambitions through a combination of his social position and his charm. He seems to have possessed enormous charm. He had all the social graces, was clever, witty and well-read. Some of his charm can still be gauged from his political and other speeches, as well as from his letters. Too few late Victorian speeches can show such a combination of good construction, clever allusion and dry humour. He certainly succeeded in charming Gladstone, at least in the early years of their relationship, a very astute and seasoned campaigner by the time Rosebery got to know him.

Allied to his charm was his social position. He had the air of a great lord. He had also, especially after his marriage to a Rothschild heiress, an immense amount of money. He was one of the last of the great Whigs of the Liberal party. He emerged just after the era of Duncan McLaren, when Scotland had no Liberal leaders in the first rank. He made his maiden speech in the Lords in 1871, and appeared to be something of a radical. To be a Whig grandee and a radical, who expressed an interest in social problems and who poked mild fun at their lordships' house, put Rosebery into a uniquely popular position in Scotland.

An indication of this position was his election as Lord Rector of Aberdeen University in 1878. Rectorial elections occupied an important place in Scottish political life; it was considered an honour to be invited to be a candidate, and it was an honour seldom offered to any of Rosebery's

youth and political inexperience. So he was glad to accept when approached by the Aberdeen student Liberals, and firmly elbowed Lord Aberdeen out of the running, despite Aberdeen's local claims and the support of Gladstone. After what Rosebery's son-in-law and biographer described as "a rather animated correspondence", Aberdeen withdrew, and Rosebery won the election against a Tory by 3 votes (2).

A popular myth emerged, both during his lifetime and subsequently, that Rosebery lacked ambition. This was far from the truth. He was certainly always happy not to pursue any office or service which would not advance his career. He was, too, throughout his life anxious to promote himself as a statesman of vision above mere party wranglings. But he was decidedly strong and determined in his ambition over things that would help him to the top. He well knew that being a Rector would consolidate the position he was making for himself in Scotland, and acted decisively.

Victory was a gamble as the result showed. But he was lucky and the next year embarked on a far greater gamble in which he was also to succeed: the Midlothian campaigns. 1879 and 1880 in Midlothian were to firmly establish Rosebery as the unofficial leader of Scottish Liberalism and to make him known throughout Britain.

The constituency of Midlothian was a marginal Tory seat. The sitting member was the son of the Duke of Buccleuch, the feudal power of the area. The idea of taking it for Liberalism was Rosebery's, and he decided to do it in the

most spectacular way possible. There was something of the old Whig in his wish; his own estate, Dalmeny, being just outside the constituency. It was known that Gladstone was not happy in his existing seat, and there was a real danger of his losing it, and he was approached to contest Midlothian. After some initial hesitation he accepted. As it was marginal, a safe seat was kept for him elsewhere. Many senior members of the party were nervous as, understandably, were the agents and local officials who would have to do the work.

Rosebery enjoyed the challenge and the sporting aspect of the contest. Gladstone knew it would be close, but took the line that the prize was worth the risk. But it was really Rosebery who was taking the risk. The idea was completely associated with him in the party and elsewhere: failure would make him look more foolish than Gladstone, and damage his aspirant career. But the rewards for success would be correspondingly high: he would be firmly established as territorial magnate and as the leader of Scottish Liberalism and Scottish popular opinion. He would also win himself a place in the upper echelons of the party. His friend Charles Cooper, the editor of The Scotsman, who helped him with the campaigns, was in no doubt that Rosebery had suggested Gladstone's candidacy with his own position in mind (3).

His gamble paid off magnificently. Gladstone's 2 campaigns, in November 1879 and March to April 1880, won him the seat

in the 1880 general election. But they did much more than just that. Both campaigns generated enormous popular enthusiasm. Gladstone played his part well, and was moved by the fervour of his reception. He worked extremely hard. Using Dalmeny as his base, he sallied forth to address meetings not only in the constituency but in Edinburgh and Glasgow as well. On one day in the November campaign he delivered the rectorial address in Glasgow, spoke to an audience of 6,000 in the afternoon and closed the day with a full after-dinner speech. One horrified Edinburgh Tory minister calculated that between November 24 and December 7 1879 Gladstone delivered 85,840 words, and concluded that his verbosity had become "a positive danger to the Commonwealth" (4).

Cooper wrote later that when Gladstone returned in March "his reception in the Heart of Midlothian was, I verily believe, the most wonderful ever accorded to any man in the purely political sphere" (5). The campaigns became famous beyond Scotland and amazed and worried the Tories, and the more conservative elements in the Liberal party. Contemporaries noted that the warmth of Gladstone's reception was equalled by the crowds' enthusiasm for Rosebery. They called for him after Gladstone had spoken, and cheered him furiously when he did speak. All the drama of the campaigns was organised by Rosebery: the torchlight processions, the bonfires and the groups of Liberals who appeared wherever Gladstone went, were all carefully pre-arranged by Rosebery. Gladstone and Rosebery were referred to as "the father and

son of the Scottish people"; and people also began to refer to Rosebery as "the uncrowned King of Scotland". This was a corruption of the name newly given to Charles Stewart Parnell and coined by T. M. Healy. With Healy's vivid phrase having caught the attention of the press and public, it was quite natural for it to be appropriately altered and applied to Rosebery.

Its use does raise the question of the importance of the influence of Parnell on Rosebery's early career. The 2 were not at this time acquainted, but Rosebery could hardly have failed to observe Parnell and his methods. References to the Irish leader in later years, indeed, show that Rosebery was well aware of him. Scottish conditions were, of course, very different to Irish, and Rosebery was hardly in a position before 1886 to be a public admirer of Parnell, since he had always to work within the framework of a British party. But with Liberalism the creed of the majority of Scots there were similarities between the approach of the 2 men; particularly as Rosebery now began to push nationalism, albeit a much more restricted form of nationalism than Parnell's. Rosebery had before him also an example of a territorial spokesman in his own party: Joseph Chamberlain. But it becomes clear that Rosebery did not see himself as just possessing a powerful home power base on the Chamberlain model; he did see himself as a national spokesman, potentially the equivalent of Parnell, though seeking different things and by different methods.

Such comparisons should not obscure the fact Rosebery was happy to use Scotland as a personal power base for himself to advance up the ladder of British Liberalism. In the context of Scottish politics, it was impracticable to see hiw own future in any other way. It was meant to be a 2-way process: Rosebery would rise to the top, but on the way he would obtain concessions to the national grievances of his country. Over the next 5 years Cooper and The Scotsman were to promote the notion of general devolution on a limited scale throughout the United Kingdom. Rosebery and his parliamentary followers were, by and large, to adopt this policy and hold to it at least until after 1900. But it seldom became a priority and, as we shall see, tended to emerge when concessions to Ireland were being suggested. Of more immediate interest was the possibility of the creation of a Secretary of State for Scotland.

It was widely believed that after the triumphs of Midlothian Rosebery would join the government Gladstone was forming in 1880. In the event he did not. After the election Gladstone sent him a warm letter of thanks:

> I should like to write about these marvellous events, but how can I? The romance of politics which befel my old age in Scotland, has spread over the whole land.... The great merit of it I apprehend lay in the original conception, which I take to have been yours, and to overshadow even your operations towards the direct production of the result. But one thing it cannot overshadow in my mind; the sense of the inexpressible aid and comfort derived day by day from your considerate ever-watchful care and tact.... I should feel profoundly ashamed of the burdens we brought you, had I not seen how truly they were borne in the spirit, which alone makes all burdens light.... I will not trouble you with more words of thanks, I feel them so poor and idle (7).

Gladstone certainly wanted Rosebery in his government and offered him the post of Under-Secretary at the India Office. Rosebery declined. His ostensible reason was that it would look as if he was being paid for his work at Midlothian if he took office. His real reasons were twofold. First, he had risen so far so fast that he hoped for a better post. Press speculation suggested that he would be offered one of the lesser ministries, perhaps even with a seat in the cabinet. Gladstone, however, much as he admired Rosebery, had determined to stick to his own rule that young men must have experience as junior ministers first, as Rosebery was to find out. Secondly, it did not suit Rosebery's plans to start a long climb up the government ladder in the relative obscurity of the India Office. He knew nothing of India at this time, and preferred to remain as the unofficial spokesman for Scotland and press Scottish interests. He could hope that if Gladstone could be persuaded to create a Scottish Secretary fairly swiftly, he could make the logical progression and get the job.

In November 1880 Rosebery delivered his rectorial address in Aberdeen: a call for the study of Scottish history and the establishment of a Scottish history chair in the university. The delivery of this suitably academic and yet eminently patriotic address was well timed. For the election of Edinburgh University's Lord Rector, for which post Rosebery was also a candidate, took place the next day, and Rosebery ensured that the full text of the Aberdeen Rectorial was printed in the Edinburgh Evening News on the eve of

poll. He won the Edinburgh Rectorship, though by a narrow margin. It was, indeed, unusual for anyone to hold 2 rectorships at the same time: further evidence of the extraordinary position he had made for himself in Scotland.

In February 1881 Rosebery wrote to Arthur Godley, Gladstone's principal private secretary, to observe that Scotland felt neglected and that, since Midlothian, people in Scotland felt that he should be in a position to do something about it.

> I never give unasked advice, but as a humble friend and supporter of the Government I venture to say one word of warning. If things go on as they are you will have Scotland as well as Ireland on your hands.... I am sorry to say a feeling is gaining ground that Scotland having served her purpose at the general election is now being completely neglected. I can say nothing to controvert that opinion. I write strongly because I feel strongly, and because blame is unjustly thrown on me as if I had something to do with the ministry.

Godley replied soothingly, though not to the point:

> The help that you can give to Mr. Gladstone and to the Government by information about Scottish affairs is quite invaluable; and I am sure you must know how very highly Mr. Gladstone values your opinion as to men and things (8).

The next month Cooper was writing to Rosebery on the same lines:

> Scotland, I venture to say, is very much discontented with the manner in which she is being treated. After making all allowances for the Irish trouble, there is much left to complain about (9).

Rosebery was running up against the problem that vexed the Scottish Home Rulers. Gladstone was becoming increasingly bound up with the Irish question, to the exclusion of everything else. This process was of course to get much worse

from the Scottish point of view. Parnell was taking up the Prime Minister's attention and could cause a great deal more trouble than Rosebery either could or wished to.

Rosebery was also pressing Scotland's claims with other members of the government. In December 1880 he discussed the possibility of the appointment of a Secretary of State with W. V. Harcourt. Harcourt was impressed and approached Gladstone; who was not. Rosebery wrote a memorandum on the subject for Harcourt, dealing mostly with the absurdities of a law officer, the Lord Advocate, having responsibility for Scottish administration (10). Harcourt was converted, but it was to be some time before Gladstone was persuaded.

In the spring of 1881, the Duke of Argyll resigned from the government. Argyll was very much an old Whig, and very little a Liberal. He had been a colleague of Gladstone's since the mid-1850s. Many were dismayed that Gladstone should have given a man of such pronounced conservative views, particularly on land questions, a seat in the 1880 Cabinet, but he did and Argyll had joined the government as Lord Privy Seal. He did not remain in it long. Forced to concentrate on Irish policy, the government proposed a traditional mixture of coercion and land reform for Ireland. The Land Act was intended to grant to Irish tenants the "three Fs": fixity of tenure, free sale and fair rents. In the words of F. S. L. Lyons "it was immensely complex and only Gladstone and a handful of experts thoroughly understood it" (11). Argyll may not have understood it, but clearly found it unacceptably radical, and resigned.

Argyll had had a certain following particularly in the west of Scotland. His departure further strengthened Rosebery's position in Scotland. Argyll had spoken up for the idea of a Scottish Secretary, but he and Rosebery seemed to greatly dislike each other. Certainly over the next few years Rosebery often singled out Argyll for attack and ridicule in his Lords speeches.

With Argyll resigning, Rosebery clearly expected to be consulted, as the spokesman for Scotland, about a successor. He was not and complained to Harcourt. Harcourt passed on the complaint to Gladstone, adding that Rosebery was very piqued as

> One of the symptoms of provocation is that he wholly declines to be consulted on Scotch business, on which I was in the habit of taking his opinion, as he says 'that he has now no relations of any kind with the Government'.

Gladstone, who did not see Rosebery's position in the same light as he did himself, was not surprisingly annoyed. He replied frostily to Harcourt:

> The notion of a title to be consulted on succession to a Cabinet office is absurd.... I believe Rosebery to have a very modest estimate of himself, and trust he has not fallen into so gross an error.

It was the first sign of friction between the 2 men. Edward Hamilton, another of Gladstone's private secretaries, agreed with his chief: "really, to set up such a claim is preposterous" (12).

Unable to exert his influence in ministerial circles, Rosebery determined to do so where he could. He made a

major speech in the Lords on the Scottish Secretary question. The idea had been brought up by Lord Fife in a short and mild speech in which he referred to the findings of a Royal commission. This Commission had in fact reported 12 years earlier and recommended merely an additional Under-Secretary in the Home Office to advise the Lord Advocate. No-one had made any points against the Commission's findings, except the Scots who said the proposal was not enough, but no-one had done anything about it. Rosebery spoke at length, giving an historical sketch of Scottish administration since the Union and re-iterating his objections to the position of the Lord Advocate. He pointed out that even those who claimed that the senior law officer could perfectly well represent Scotland must admit that no Lord Advocate had ever been given a seat in a Cabinet.

He closed his speech with a picturesque allusion, and a vague threat.

> The words Home Rule have begun to be distinctly and loudly mentioned in Scotland.... I believe that the late Lord Beaconsfield, on one occasion in Scotland, implored the people of Scotland to give up 'mumbling the dry bones of political economy, and munching the remainder biscuit of effete Liberalism'. I believe the people of Scotland, at the present moment, are mumbling the dry bones of political neglect, and munching the remainder biscuit of Irish legislation (13).

The call for a full Scottish Secretary evoked no response from the government. Instead, the idea of the 1869 Royal Commission was revived. This was in part fortuitous, as a vacancy in the Home Office occurred in July 1881. Harcourt suggested to Gladstone that Rosebery be offered the post on

the understanding that his work would be principally concerned with Scottish affairs. Characteristically for Harcourt, he also complained that what he needed was another minister in the Commons and of the difficulties the appointment would create. Gladstone, still keen to have Rosebery in, concurred, and Rosebery accepted. He did not abandon his desire for a full Scottish Secretary to be appointed, but he had realised by this time that Gladstone was not to be persuaded to act in the immediate future on this point. He was anxious to start his own ministerial career. Given Gladstone's re-iterated determination that he should serve as an Under-Secretary, this proposal offered the chance to both enter the government and to be the official spokesman for Scotland.

The arrangement, however, was to prove unsatisfactory for a number of reasons. First, Rosebery was told unofficially that the job was to be temporary and the vague promise of a proper Secretaryship for Scotland was extended, though no date for this was fixed. Secondly, no official arrangement was made as to the Lord Advocate and Rosebery found in practice that he was considered only a Home Office figure and the Lord Advocate continued to be considered the Scottish spokesman. This rankled even though the Lord Advocate, John McLaren, was a personal friend who had helped at Midlothian. Thirdly, though Harcourt had been the architect of the appointment, Rosebery found it difficult to work with him. This was by no means all Rosebery's fault: many more kind and patient men than he were driven to

despair and rage by Sir William. The mutual dislike between Harcourt and Rosebery started during this period.

However imprecise the official arrangements, Rosebery's appointment was greeted with enthusiasm in Scotland. He himself encouraged his supporters by describing himself, in a speech in Glasgow in the autumn, as "the backstairs Minister for Scotland" (14). One of his chief correspondents at the time was Holmes Ivory W.S., one of the agents for the 1880 Midlothian election and Honorary Secretary of the Scottish Liberal Club in Edinburgh. He was delighted that Rosebery had entered the government and pressed him, unsuccessfully, to accept a banquet in his honour at the Club. This would be the least they could do for him, Ivory wrote, since it was common knowledge that "in the past few years you have done more than any other Scotchman to inspire all interested in Scottish Liberal politics" (15).

In the autumn of 1881 Rosebery made 3 major speeches. First, he was invited to Dundee to receive congratulatory addresses from the local Liberal associations. He devoted his speeches to Scottish affairs, and was in modest and conciliatory mood. He pledged himself to serve Scotland, and said that while Scotland still needed a proper minister, she could not always expect him to be in the Cabinet (16).

The other 2 speeches, in Greenock and Hull, were principally concerned with Ireland. The Land League had just been suppressed and Parnell put in Kilmainham Jail, and Gladstone had just delivered his "resources of civilization ... are

not yet exhausted" speech. These speeches were the first major reference Rosebery had ever made to Ireland. He took a mild line, assuring his audience that the Government had done their best to appease Irish opinion and had suppressed the League only as a last resort. He told the Irish that they had found one of their few genuine friends in Gladstone and that Ireland would learn to bless their "latest and greatest benefactor". The speech in Hull was devoted to attacking the opposition who, he claimed, certainly had nothing to boast of in their treatment of Ireland.

> I do maintain that it is not for the Conservatives, who have never lifted their hands to help Ireland, to hinder the Government in the task in which we are engaged (17).

He felt less conciliatory the next spring, after the announcement of the "Kilmainham Treaty" and the release of Parnell. He was deeply opposed to this course, and when Forster and Cowper, the Irish government resigned, wished to follow them. He wrote a 4 page memorandum on the subject, for his own use. In it he argued that the Parnell the government was releasing was exactly the same Parnell that it had imprisoned. His imprisonment had been right; it must be wrong to free him. For though "it is believed that humoured they will range themselves on the side of order", there was no evidence for this. What then was his own position?

> This is emphatically a new departure. There was no question of alliance with, or reliance upon, Mr. Parnell when I joined the Government. I suddenly find myself embarked on an enterprise which I cannot justify or defend. If I remain in the Government I am for life connected, however humbly, with this policy, ... and yet this policy I believe to be a fatal mistake.

On the other hand, he argued to himself, he had his personal regard for Gladstone to consider, and his place in the government was so minor he would not seriously be thought to be condoning the Treaty. In the event, he did not resign. A pencilled note in Rosebery's hand on the bottom of the memorandum reads: "This paper was interrupted by the news of Cavendish's assassination" (18). He felt that the Phoenix Park murders in Dublin changed the situation completely: like Gladstone, he had known Lord Frederick Cavendish well, and he decided it was his duty to give Gladstone all the support he could.

There is, of course, no evidence other than his memorandum that Rosebery really intended to resign. The memorandum seems, however, to have genuinely been written just for his own use and, at the least, it seems reasonable to conclude from it that he was deeply opposed to the "Treaty". In particular, he was reacting strongly against what he saw as ingrained disloyalty in the Irish leaders. As we have seen, this was a common reaction amongst the supporters of Scotland's national interests. Again, Rosebery would have been looking to his Scottish position and, if he did seriously contemplate resignation, it would have been as much for this reason as for his personal feelings.

Having decided not to resign over Ireland, Rosebery was eventually to resign, in June 1883, over Scotland. His emotional reaction to Phoenix Park restored his relations with Gladstone to their former warmth. Indeed, such was

felt to be their closeness that Rosebery was elected by the other Liberal leaders to the awkward and unrewarding task of speaking to Gladstone about his work with London prostitutes. Their relationship, however, was to be put under a strain over the next year from which it never fully recovered. For Rosebery proceeded, during the second half of 1882 and the first half of 1883, to bombard Gladstone with a series of letters outlining Scottish grievances and explaining how distressing he was finding his position in the government (19). The correspondence was not without its unintentionally humorous side, as Rosebery complained and Gladstone replied, alternating kindly patience and evident irritation.

Seen from Gladstone's side, Rosebery's complaints must have seemed tiresome and overly particular. He was, after all, only an Under-Secretary, and Gladstone had pressing problems, such as Egypt and Ireland to take up his time. Rhodes James, indeed, gives the impression that it was really rather poor form for Rosebery to pursue his chief so relentlessly.

But from Rosebery's point of view, his persistence was entirely justified. He saw himself primarily as Scotland's spokesman and believed he had been given office precisely to work for Scotland. He now found himself with the appearance of power without the substance. Thus his supporters in Scotland would be disappointed that he was unable to deliver anything, particularly towards creating a Secretary

of State. He feared they would feel he was not trying hard enough or had deserted them.

He had also the example of Ireland before him. He was hardly in a position, on his own in the House of Lords, to practise obstruction or harry the Government seriously; nor would he have wanted to. But he was on close terms with Gladstone and could reasonably have believed that by pressing him hard and frequently he could get some measures for Scotland. Unfortunately, the tone of his letters tended to be petulant and self-obsessed, and Gladstone and his entourage took the view that he was asking for more than his position in the government justified. They also suspected that he was asking for himself as much as for his country. Gladstone was probably unaware of the special position Rosebery felt he occupied, or he was reluctant to accept it. He felt that it behoved Rosebery to do his duties as an Under-Secretary conscientiously and wait for future promotion.

The correspondence began in May 1882, just after Phoenix Park. Rosebery enquired if a vacant post could be filled by a Scot. Gladstone refused, and though Rosebery sent a polite acknowledgement ("beg to express my regret for having interfered in the matter"), he burst out to Hamilton:

> I confess I think Scotland is as usual treated abominably. Justice for Ireland means everything for her even to the payment of the natives' debts. Justice to Scotland means insulting neglect. I leave for Scotland next week with the view of blowing up a prison or shooting a policeman (20).

At the end of June Rosebery wrote again at length, this time on a Scottish Endowments Bill. The Bill was now before parliament for the third time: though the vast majority of Scottish members supported it, it had lapsed because the Government had not bothered to press it through. He appealed to Gladstone not to let this happen a third time. The letter set out with clarity, indeed with bluntness, how Rosebery saw his position, so is worth quoting from at some length.

> I am sorry to trouble you in the midst of your labours with a letter. I would not do so did I not think the matter one of the greatest importance both to Scotland and the administration of Scottish affairs by the present Government.... What are indeed the facts as they appear to the most impartial eye? The Prime Minister was returned by a Scottish constituency, backed by an overwhelming majority of Scottish members. From the day of the first meeting of the new Parliament until the present day of its third session, if I am correctly informed, not one minute of Government time has been allotted to Scotland or Scottish affairs. Can you be surprised that the people of Scotland complain? Of course the first persons to bear the brunt of this are the Lord Advocate and myself. We are not conscious of deserving blame; in and out of the session we have done all we could. But I do not see what more we can do, and our reward, more especially mine, will be to return to Scotland to be taunted with our incapacity to get any attention paid to Scotland. More especially mine, because my appointment was supposed to indicate that greater attention would be paid to Scottish business, whereas it indicates nothing of the sort.... The view is taken in Scotland that I have a considerable share in the responsibility; and certainly wherever the Scottish halfpence may go, I shall get the Scottish kicks. That is an eventuality which I am not prepared to face, when I am of opinion that the aggressive boot contains a toe of justice (21).

This question over the Bill dragged on, and Rosebery's complaints reached a new level in December. He discovered that Gladstone intended some cabinet changes, but was to do

nothing for Scotland or Rosebery. Rosebery took this as a revocation of the undertaking that the present arrangement would be only temporary, and told Gladstone so. He left for Dalmeny to "consult ... one or two of (his) principal supporters", after confiding in Hamilton that he had hoped Gladstone would take the opportunity of cabinet changes to create a Scottish Secretary and give him the job. In Edinburgh he spoke to Cooper and others and then returned to the attack, writing to Gladstone.

> You are so strong that you can afford to disregard any claim or interest you please. I, on the other hand, am obliged to keep in view the one interest of the nation which I serve and which made me what little I am. I cannot, therefore, honestly remain, if I wished it, a party to an arrangement which I think derogatory to the national position and injurious to the national interests.... I serve a country which is the backbone of our party, but which is never recognised. I, and those whom I have consulted, feel that it is necessary now to make a stand on its behalf, and that is why I am obliged to take up the present position.

Gladstone, as we have seen, would not understand the "territorial imperative" of Rosebery's position, and was now getting extremely angry. He wrote to Lord Granville:

> I am sorry to say that Rosebery has inflicted on me a set of letters which appear to me astonishingly foolish, about the neglect of his country, the necessities of his position, and the like: a tempest in a tea-kettle. It is marvellous how a man of such character and such gifts can be so silly.

The correspondence drifted off, both men being slightly mollified through the efforts of Granville and others. But it was to continue intermittently for the next 6 months (22).

In the spring of 1883 H. C. E. Childers, the new Chancellor of the Exchequer, produced a scheme to create a Local

Government Board for Scotland with a parliamentary head (23). When it was considered in Cabinet, Harcourt made it clear that while he did not care about the plan either way, he favoured its adoption as a way of retaining Rosebery. The scheme was adopted, but by then Rosebery had definitely decided to resign, which he did in June 1883.

Cooper had been pressing resignation since Rosebery's visit to Edinburgh in December. A long letter from the nationalist Lord Bute in April must have strengthened his resolve: this was precisely the kind of impression that he was afraid of from Scotland.

> The whole object of Mr. Gladstone's Government seems to be to stamp out everything Scotch as much as possible - a poor return for his success in Midlothian, ... not to mention the amount of support he has always had from here. Notwithstanding the xpressed (sic) wish of the whole country, the Treaty of Union is to be continued to be violated by there being no Secretary of State. You are to be tried to get your mouth shut personally by being made Lord Privy Seal (24).

The implication that Rosebery would condone the continued neglect of Scotland in return for promotion would have fatally reduced his influence there. In fact Rosebery managed to emerge from this period of office with his standing in Scotland undamaged. Holmes Ivory like Cooper approved his decision to resign and wrote the epitaph on the whole episode.

> I am very sorry that the government have been unable to retain your services, but I have a strong opinion that you were right not to consent any longer to hold the position of Under Secretary. I should much like to have seen you Minister for Scotland with a seat in the Cabinet and a position to a large extent, if not altogether, independent of the Home Secretary (25).

In November 1882 Rosebery had delivered his Edinburgh rectorial, on "Patriotism", in an atmosphere wild even for rectorials. In July 1883, a month after his resignation, he was given the freedom of Edinburgh. Aberdeen and Dundee granted him their freedoms the next year, evidence of his continuing popularity. Childers' scheme for Scotland passed the Commons and Rosebery spoke in its favour in the Lords who, however, rejected it. In any case, Rosebery had already told Gladstone that he would not take the Presidency of a Scottish Local Government Board, if he were to be offered it. He would only rejoin the government as a Cabinet member. Having seen the scheme fail and made this declaration to Gladstone, he took himself on a world tour, spending much time in Australia.

Rosebery enjoyed his trip enourmously. He was very impressed by the Empire, and discovered the romance and charm of the imperial idea in a major way. Though he was never to become a fierce Jingoist, he was to remain a convinced imperialist for the rest of his life. The Empire and foreign affairs generally were to become the other great interest and force in his political life.

To what extent did they displace Scotland as his chief preoccupation? It is convenient to see something symbolic in his resigning the office of Scottish representative and touring the Empire, but it is, of course, not as simple as that. For one thing, it is worth making the point that there was no question of Lord Rosebery being dropped by Scotland. To the end of his life, in 1928, he continued to

be referred to, and deferred to, in an enormous variety of Scottish questions. In due course, Glasgow and St. Andrews Universities both made him Rector. He continued to have a large correspondence from Scotland: as some like Cooper and Holmes Ivory fell away, others like Gibson Carmichael took their place to expound Scottish feelings and Scottish political gossip.

The degree to which Rosebery retained an interest in what they told him is less certain. He did continue to maintain his belief in some degree of devolution for Scotland, and he certainly pressed the case for a Scottish Minister to its conclusion. It was a question of emphasis. He refers to himself less and less in Scottish terms, of accountability to Scotland. Certainly when he was invited to stand for the Edinburgh rectorship, when his term finished, he declined.

Early in 1885 he rejoined the Government, being given a seat in the Cabinet as First Commissioner of Works and Privy Seal. Rosebery did not particularly distinguish himself in one of Government's least interesting ministries, but in any case the Government fell some 4 months later. He was now in the position of having fulfilled Gladstone's conditions for high office. He had served as an Under Secretary and in a junior ministry. Admittedly, neither post had covered him with glory or revealed him as a staunch or responsible party man. But he had held the offices, and when Gladstone returned to power at the beginning of 1886, he was sent to the Foreign Office. To take a cynical attitude, Scotland had now served its purpose.

When Rosebery rejoined the Government in 1885, the Cabinet was considering Joseph Chamberlain's idea for devolution, the so-called Central Board scheme. Rosebery toyed with Chamberlain's idea, passing him a note in Cabinet:

> Would you take a stroll tomorrow morning, or dine quietly tomorrow evening? I am a Scottish Home Ruler as well as Irish.

Chamberlain replied:

> Your last remark is most to the point. I had a talk with Cooper the other night and found him in favour of a scheme for Scotland which is exactly my own for Ireland. I suspected you might have been prompting him. I cannot walk tomorrow, first because I never take exercise, second because I have a Royal Commission. But I will dine with you quietly if I can leave the House (26).

In the event Rosebery voted against Central Board when it came up again in Cabinet. The scheme was of course designed primarily with Ireland in mind. It was curious that Rosebery should oppose it, since he was to continue to bless ideas for devolution, especially to Scotland. There are 2 explanations. First, the scheme was opposed by Spencer, the Irish Viceroy, and Rosebery felt that he should support Spencer, for whom he had a high regard. Secondly, he shared Gladstone's suspicions of Chamberlain and disliked Chamberlain's emphasis on presenting the electorate with large programmes. He was not anxious for Chamberlain to be seen to be doing things for Scotland and would not have been pleased to hear about Chamberlain hobnobbing with Cooper.

The long-awaited Bill to create a Scottish Secretary was on its way through parliament when the government fell. The

measure was not as full as Rosebery had wished as the post was not to carry Cabinet status. Nonetheless he proposed the second reading in the Lords in July, and the Tories, while not enthusiastic, decided not to oppose it. It passed, and Crewe seemed to capture Rosebery's mood when he wrote that Rosebery greeted its passing with "a sigh of relief" (27).

By then he and Gladstone were involved in the general election and another Midlothian campaign. Rosebery made 2 major speeches to meetings in Scotland. In Edinburgh he said:

> I have no hesitation in saying that I believe the main problem before the constituencies ... will be the greatest that has come before the public since I have entered political life, ... the question of Local Government for England, for Scotland, and for Ireland. What I believe the Liberal party will have to propose ... is this - the largest possible amount of local self-government, consistently with the Union of the Empire.

People might argue, he added, that Ireland was too disloyal to be handed control of her own affairs, but it was about the only experiment that had never been tried in Ireland, and as Liberals it behoved them to try (28). This speech seems to underline the point that Rosebery was prepared to favour, even encourage, some scheme of devolution, but not with Chamberlain.

In October he spoke at Paisley. He devoted much of his speech to the approaches being made to Parnell by the Tories. He derided, not without humour, the spectacle of a Tory-Parnellite alliance. He took a rather stronger line on

Ireland. Parnell was claiming Ireland should be dealt with like the self-governing colonies with her own independent parliament. But, said Rosebery, returning to his "Kilmainham Treaty" point:

> There is one great and essential difference between Ireland and our colonies, and it is this - that the colonies are loyal and Ireland, I greatly fear, is not.

He returned, however, to the basic point of his previous speech: devolution all round.

> Whenever you can do it, try and treat Ireland exactly as you would treat Scotland or Wales. If you pass a measure of local government for Great Britain, pass as near as may be exactly the same measure of local government for Ireland (29).

This of course was in some ways less a call for Irish devolution than Scottish. The passage was to be important in later years, as he was to go back to it when he was trying to pull back from Irish Home Rule.

In November Holmes Ivory finally got his way and Rosebery consented to a banquet in his honour, to be organised by the Scottish Liberal Club. Seven hundred guests attended, a remarkable tribute to Rosebery's continuing popularity in Scotland. Among them were Gladstone, then at Dalmeny for the campaign, Aberdeen, Campbell-Bannerman, Marjoribanks and Goschen. In all there were 12 speeches, making it a marathon occasion even by late Victorian standards.

Holmes Ivory read an address to Rosebery from the Club and the Liberal Associations of Scotland, in which he was given the credit for the new Scottish Minister:

> The interest taken by your Lordship in all questions affecting the welfare of the Scottish people, and your

> intimate acquaintance with the history and literature of the country, have long been regarded with admiration by all sections of the community. In particular, the important subject of Scottish administration will always be associated with your name, and it is mainly to your efforts that the people of Scotland are indebted for the recent Act for the creation of a Scottish Department, presided over by a Secretary of State.

Rosebery made a gracious speech of reply. Perhaps because he had Gladstone in his audience, he again slightly changed the emphasis of his call for devolution. This time he called for Scotland to fall back and let Ireland go ahead.

> We all fought that great battle on behalf of Scottish administration. But that was not a contest of a party, much less the effort of an individual; it was the contest of a whole nation determined to see efficiency restored to its administration. I was willing enough to speak - too willing, perhaps, to speak - on that subject when the battle was raging; but now that victory has been won all along the line, it now seems to me that it best becomes us to be silent. But let me say one word on the general aspect of this question as I regard it. When I, as Mr. Parnell would say, took my coat off in that cause, I did it not merely on behalf of Scottish administration, but because I believe that there is one principle with which the future of the Liberal party will have much to do, the principle that where there is a vigorous and a real and a loyal nationality, and that the better policy is to satisfy its just aspirations, for by so doing you will be promoting in the highest and the best sense the efficiency of the unity of the Empire at large....
>
> If you can obtain from the representatives of Ireland a clear and constitutional demand, which will represent the wishes of the people of Ireland, and which will not conflict with the unity or the supremacy of this country, I believe that by satisfying that demand, in such a way as not to need further readjustment, but to meet the just demands of the Irish people, you will have cut off forever the poisonous spring of discontent ... (30).

It is interesting to note the comparison he made between himself and Parnell.

The general election gave the Liberals 335 seats, the Tories 249 and the Irish nationalists 86. The Tories and the Nationalists thus had together exactly the same number of seats as the Liberals. The election brought into parliament the man who was to become the most important of Rosebery's Scottish supporters: Richard Burdon Haldane. Haldane came from a Perthshire laird's family and was born in Edinburgh in 1856. He had attended Edinburgh and Gottingen Universities, where he developed a life-long interest in philosophy, and a life-long admiration for the more reflective aspects of the German character. He had then worked successfully for the Bar, and was an accomplished and intelligent young man when elected the Liberal member for East Lothian. Haldane had an enormous capacity for work and an interest in progressive social reform. He had also an endless appetite for intrigue and a tendency to pomposity, neither of which was to endear him to the more straightforward members of his party.

The election saw the brief departure from parliament of Rosebery's other principal Scottish lieutenant, Ronald Munro Ferguson. Ferguson too came from a landowning family, with estates in Ross and in Fife. Born in 1860, he had served in the Guards before being elected for Ross and Cromarty in a by-election in 1884. At the general election, however, he lost the seat to one of the Crofter candidates. In the 1886 general election he narrowly failed to win Dunbartonshire, but was returned to the Commons shortly afterwards at a by-election in Leith. He continued to represent Leith

until made Governor General of Australia by Asquith in 1914.

In December 1885 after the election came the famous "Hawarden Kite", when Herbert Gladstone disclosed that his father was considering a full Home Rule scheme for Ireland. Rosebery had been mildly involved in the discussions that followed the curious election result and had visited Gladstone at Hawarden. He was, however, amazed by the declaration in the "Kite", as was Liberal opinion in Scotland. Encouraged by Rosebery, many Scottish Liberals had become enthusiastic about the prospect of some form of limited general devolution. The proposal to grant a full parliament to Ireland, however, was of quite a different order, and took some time to adjust to. One can trace this process in Holmes Ivory's letters to Rosebery from December to May 1886. He starts by expressing shock and horror. Then he fears that the Liberal party in Scotland is finished. Gradually his letters become more optimistic, he is himself converted to Gladstone's view and he finds that more and more of the people he talks to are coming round (31).

Rosebery himself was of course critical in this process. He seems to have decided very quickly to back his chief. Though it will always remain doubtful if he was ever more than just acquiescent in the decision to go for Home Rule, he does not seem to have seriously considered leaving the party. There was every tie and loyalty to Gladstone to

hold him and, though he had expressed doubts about Ireland, he was associated with the concept of devolution. He knew he could expect high office when Gladstone formed a government, and he was not close to either Hartington or Chamberlain, the leading seceders. With Hartington and Chamberlain gone, his chances of becoming Gladstone's successor were dramatically increased too, more especially as his reputation gained enormously from his decision to stick by Gladstone. But there was never any question of a zealous conversion to Irish Home Rule with Rosebery, as there was with Gladstone. His support was pragmatic and nothing more. He continued to be unenthusiastic about the Irish: when Gladstone assented to the notion that the Irish were very grateful to him, during a private dinner, Rosebery at once disagreed, describing the Irish as awkward and ungrateful (32).

In February 1886, Gladstone formed his government and Rosebery became Foreign Secretary. Though the government was to last only a few months, Rosebery found his new post very congenial. With all the turmoil surrounding the first Home Rule Bill, he was left very much to himself: the Bill did not get to the Lords, so he was not expected to speak on it, and Gladstone was too busy to take a close interest in what Rosebery was up to.

Gladstone introduced the Home Rule Bill in April. By then, though it was clear that there would be resignations, the Liberal party in Scotland was settling down. John Reid of

Edinburgh sent Rosebery a memorandum on the state of Scottish opinion as

> I believe it is being said in London that Liberal Scotland is somewhat shaky upon the present phase of the Irish question, and I have been at some pains to try and get reliable information of the feeling generally prevalent.

He said that the situation was fairly encouraging, though there was some doubt as to the financial arrangements envisaged after Home Rule, as "they trust Mr. Gladstone, (though) they do not trust Irishmen" (33).

Munro Ferguson sent a message to his "friends in Edinburgh" through Rosebery in May.

> Those who oppose the Irish Government Bill appear to confuse two essentially different and almost antagonistic principles. They confuse union with centralisation. Union it appears to me no more implies one legislative body for these Kingdoms than it implies one form of religion.... And as regards Edinburgh, nay as regards Scotland, I venture to say that my countrymen will grasp the situation and will show once more that they are not deluded by phrases: but give a hearty support to the Government in their endeavour to add in a contented Ireland a new strength to the Empire (34).

Nonetheless Scotland was still considered to be uncertain. James Bryce wrote to Rosebery of a conversation he had had with Mrs. Gladstone. She had told Bryce that her husband was "most anxious" that Rosebery should continue to work for the Irish policy "attaching the greatest importance to the influence which your word would have in Scotland, where we are at present supposed to be comparatively weak" (35).

One of the reasons why Scotland was supposed to be unsure was the loss of The Scotsman. Cooper had, in a long series of editorials, been running a campaign for some sort of

devolution, and discussing the question with Rosebery and Chamberlain. Cooper had talked the subject over with Gladstone during the 1885 election: as Cooper recalled it:

> Mr. Gladstone asked me if I did not think we had gone rather far in urging the creation of such bodies (i.e. National Councils). One might be possible in Scotland; but what of Ireland? He showed that what had been said in the paper had been brought to his knowledge; for he alluded to particular arguments that had been used. My answer was that within the limits that had been suggested such bodies would be safe. He made no comment on the reply.

Gladstone was obviously being highly disingenuous here, and trying to discover how far a keen general devolutionist, with an especial interest in Scotland, might be prepared to go in dealing with Ireland. In the event, Cooper utterly rejected the Home Rule proposals, feeling that they went way beyond anything he had envisaged and that they would mean, in effect, the repeal of the Union. It was a considerable wrench for him to break with Liberalism: he was devoted to Rosebery and had enjoyed his position as Rosebery's confidant and adviser. After much soul-searching, however, he concluded that he had no alternative. He wrote a series of letters to Rosebery complaining of Gladstone's "downright folly" and appealing to him to try and reverse the policy (36).

When he realised that there would be no change of mind, he turned The Scotsman away from Gladstonian Liberalism. From then on the paper was to be Liberal Unionist, and it gradually became more Unionist, less Liberal and fiercely anti-Irish. Holmes Ivory, in a letter to Rosebery, gave a

telling description of a visit to Cooper.

> C. was nervous and agitated and personally of course most friendly but I could do nothing to move him. He spoke with terrible bitterness of Mr. G. said the Bills meant the repeal of the Union and in the event of a dissolution he would write against the Bills with all the force at his command. I am dreadfully sorry for poor C. He is not looking well and he is feeling I can see most unhappy. I am convinced that the proprietors of the paper though of C's opinion are not the mainspring - C. is writing as he feels.... He maintains that he is as strong for Home Rule as ever but that these Bills are repeal (37).

After lengthy debate, Gladstone's Home Rule Bill was rejected in the Commons on June 8 by 30 votes. Ninety three Liberals voted with the Tories. Gladstone decided on dissolution, and the Liberals lost the ensuing general election, opponents of the Bill standing against Gladstonian candidates as Liberal Unionists. With the party now out of office, Rosebery took himself on another world tour, this time spending much of the time in India. He returned in 1887, and on April 27 made a major speech on Ireland, addressing the Glasgow Junior Liberal Association on "Conciliation or Coercion?". He spoke for an hour and three quarters, which he privately noted as "appalling" (38). The speech is interesting as it represents his first major statement on Ireland since 1885, before the Home Rule Bill was proposed.

Rosebery opened by again drawing a comparison between Ireland and Scotland in attacking the opponents of national feeling, those who tell

> the Scottish and the Irish, that we must sit in a corner and be good children, simply because we are not a nation in the sense of the word in which these

gentlemen understand it.

But, he went on to say, only one policy was currently relevant: policy towards Ireland. Even if Gladstone were to renounce Home Rule the question would not now go away, as the present Tory government's coercion would focus attention on Ireland and her continuing problems. He re-affirmed his faith in Gladstone: "I am one of those who have an almost unlimited belief in Mr. Gladstone's capacity". He then tried to illustrate the disabilities of the Roman Catholics in eighteenth century Ireland. He suggested to his audience that they imagine substituting Scotland for Ireland and Protestant for Catholic and then ask themselves what they would have suffered under such a system. It was, he added, idle to pretend that the Union had produced a contented Ireland; 87 years of coercion showed that it had not.

Turning to the previous year's Home Rule Bill, he said that the party had put forward a principle: that Ireland should have a legislature to regulate her domestic affairs. That, he claimed, was all they had insisted on as a principle. Beyond that anything was open for discussion, within that principle they were all ready, "I believe I speak for every colleague of mine", to consider any modifying proposals. He closed this mammoth speech with a fine bit of oratory.

> Last year, the Liberal party, headed by a great statesman, produced a scheme which satisfied the hopes and expectations of Ireland. For a moment it seemed as if all would be well, and as if the distressful country would know the end of its long sorrows and its long travail. But it was not to be.... Our duty is plain. We have to fight the battle - strenuously as

> I trust, earnestly as I believe - the battle of a policy of conciliation against a policy of coercion. The policy of conciliation is not strained; it droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven. If you adopt it and it succeeds, you will reap a rich and an abundant harvest - an hundred-fold; but if it fail, you will at any rate have tried an experiment that you will never regret, and you will have placed for all time England in a better position to deal with our unhappy fellow-countrymen in Ireland (39).

This speech was received with enormous enthusiasm. Rosebery was frequently interrupted by cheering and the audience called for him to continue when he said he must conclude after an hour and a half. But despite their cheers the speech could not be described as a cry from the heart. It was well constructed and at times witty at the expense of the Liberal Unionists. But there was no passion, no appeal to national sentiment, it was a reasoned and reasonable approach to the question. He laid great stress on his insistence that Liberals would not be dogmatic as to the form or nature of Home Rule; and there was the sentence at the beginning referring to Scotland. A close reading of the speech reveals that it was, in a sense, still the general devolution of pre-1886 that he was calling for, with an emphasis on Ireland. Revealingly, contemporaries were even at this stage doubtful of how enthusiastic Rosebery really was about Home Rule. Two letters to him from Munro Ferguson illustrate this. In March 1887 Ferguson wrote: "You are still supposed to be a bit uncertain about Home Rule in some quarters", and in April that the "head of one of the Edinburgh Divisional Associations (was) asking to know privately which way your leanings are on Ireland" (40).

The next year, 1888, Rosebery spoke 4 times on Ireland, keeping much to his "Conciliation or Coercion" line. Revealingly Crewe refers to these speeches as just doing "his duty as a loyal party man" (41). On one of these occasions he spoke in Edinburgh with T. P. O'Connor; his old ally The Scotsman commenting caustically:

> while it was somewhat humiliating to see Lord Rosebery in co-partnership with T. P., it had to be admitted that the genuine Nationalist made the more robust speech (42).

On another of these occasions he spoke briefly of the prospects of Scottish Home Rule. He did not exclude such an idea, but took a Gladstonian line in asking for Ireland to be allowed to go on alone and "unfettered". When Irish Home Rule was passed then "you will find me no laggard in serving you" (43). This was not a very dramatic offer but, while he did his duty talking on Home Rule, his enthusiasm was now directed elsewhere. He was keeping up his interest in imperial affairs, strengthened by his second Empire tour, and was giving much time to the work of the Imperial Federation League. He was also busying himself with municipal and social reform, devoting much of the years from 1889 to 1891 to the new London County Council.

R. B. Haldane, meanwhile, had made his first major parliamentary speech: in 1887 on the Tory Coercion Bill that Rosebery had condemned in Glasgow. He and Asquith had toured Ireland the year before, concentrating on rural problems. They had spoken to both landlords and tenants and had witnessed an eviction. His speech on the Coercion

Bill was standard enough: he disapproved of coercion, it was bound to fail, and the only statesmanlike answer to Ireland's problems was Home Rule. Gladstone was in the chamber and congratulated Haldane on his effort.

Haldane, however, was not to become merely a faithful Gladstonian and standard-bearer for Home Rule. He emerged as one of the chief figures in an identifiable group of young Liberals, of "coming men". This group included himself, Asquith, Munro Ferguson, and Edward Grey. They were concerned principally with social reform and wished to develop policies that were radical, attractive to the electorate and a viable alternative to socialism. They did not wish to abandon the commitment to Irish Home Rule, but they did want to prepare other policies to put forward. In a sense they were filling the gap left in the party by the departure of Chamberlain. This group looked to Rosebery for leadership, and they looked also to John Morley. Morley was a leading radical, though he was increasingly to be identified exclusively with Home Rule. The group at the same time were moving, under Rosebery's influence, towards imperialism, a creed that Morley could never approve of.

In 1886 3 of this group, Haldane, Grey and Ferguson, defied the party whips over Ireland. The Tory government introduced another Irish Land Purchase Act to assist tenants to buy their farms. Haldane and his friends decided to vote for the measure because they believed it to be a good thing despite their party's officially declared opposition. Not

surprisingly, this decision caused much resentment and suspicion on their own side; Asquith, politically the most astute member of the group, sympathised but characteristically decided not to follow them.

Haldane further asserted his independence of mind the same year in an article in the Contemporary Review. In the article he criticised Home Rule for its absorption of Liberal thinking, and argued forcefully that Home Rule alone was not enough to offer to the people of England and Scotland. He was one of the first of the Liberals to express such opinions in public. His exertions in 1888 may not have particularly endeared him to Gladstone, but they had got him noticed and they had impressed Rosebery. In the article Haldane wrote:

> The most decided admirer of the resolution and clear-sightedness of the Irish leaders, and the undeviating adherence to the method which has obtained for them so considerable a measure of success, may express the opinion that the alliance between their party and the majority of the Liberals has been temporarily prejudicial to the general aims of the latter. The question of the future government of Ireland is too engrossing not to absorb more than its just proportion of the public attention. And just because many of the electors are keenly interested in it, and from the bottom of their souls wish well to a cause for which they are ready to make sacrifices, it happens that they become for the time apt to regard the establishment of a Parliament and Executive in Dublin as the be-all and end-all of Liberal policy.... Today, our first and paramount duty is to gain the assent of the people of England and Scotland to the Irish policy, for which we have set our hands to the plough. But, if from no higher motive, in the interests not only of ourselves as a party, but of our Irish policy, it is of urgent importance that we should not leave the people to subsist on what for them is, after all, an abstraction. There is a vast amount of popular goodwill at our disposal for the purposes of social reform. It is for those who are responsible for our leadership to see that this is not neglected and lost (44).

One of the chief places where this group of young Liberals met was the "Eighty Club", of which Haldane was a founder and for several years the Secretary. In 1889 the Club gave a dinner to Lord Spencer and Rosebery was invited to take the chair. The sensation of the evening was the appearance of Parnell as the guest of Sir Charles Russell. Russell had unmasked the forger Pigott for Parnell a couple of weeks before and Parnell was then at the height of his popularity in Liberal circles. Spencer spoke for an hour on the circumstances that had persuaded him to change his mind in favour of Home Rule between 1885 and 1886. Parnell spoke, but characteristically and to the disappointment of his audience, did not refer to Pigott at all. Rosebery also made a brief speech and was introduced to Parnell, whom he had never met. As Rosebery noted, it was "a striking occasion" (45). Parnell sat next to Haldane and made one of the remarks that so amazed and fascinated his political contemporaries. As Haldane recounted it:

> he said to me ... that he had been reading a most remarkable book, which threw more light on the Irish question than any book he had seen. I ... eagerly asked what this new source of knowledge was, and he replied, 'It is a book called <u>The English in Ireland</u> by a Mr. Froude' (46).

A few months later Rosebery was among several Liberal peers who spoke in the Lords debate on the report of the Special Commission, set up to examine the connections, if any, between "Parnellism and Crime". Rosebery claimed that the proceedings had been political and in no sense judicial. Without the forged Pigott letters no investigation would

have ever got under way, so it was dishonest to try and draw conclusions when the central piece of evidence had been proved to be false. He concluded by appealing to the Irish peers not to continue to always range themselves against the Irish people. For, he informed them, with a smug though tacit reference to his own position as a popular lord:

> If there be one truth more strictly and universally written than another by history, it is this: that an aristocracy divorced from a nation is a doomed aristocracy (47).

Rosebery had done his party duty by speaking on the Special Commission report. The most striking fact about his behaviour during the honeymoon period between Parnell and the Liberals, however, was his absence from the great Edinburgh meeting following the granting of the freedom of the city to Parnell. Both from his position in the party, and from his position in Scotland, he was the natural choice to have chaired the meeting. There is no evidence that he was asked to, indeed his papers reveal a complete blank on the whole episode, but it is inconceivable that he would not have got the honour if he had wished it. Edinburgh Liberalism tended to be radical and was to be quite hostile to Rosebery from the late 1890s. But the situation in the party was utterly different then than it was in 1889, when Rosebery was still seen as Scotland's leader, Gladstone's favoured son and a supporter of the Home Rule policy. This was still, just, the era of the Midlothian campaigns when Rosebery was the darling of the Edinburgh crowds. The impetus, or rather the lack of impetus, must have come from

his side and, as such, provides evidence not only of the waning of importance of Scotland to him, but also of his desire to start to distance himself from Gladstone's Home Rule policy.

During 1890 and 1891 Rosebery was involved with his senior colleagues in discussions over the future form of Home Rule. With "the flowing tide", as Gladstone called it, with Liberalism, Rosebery and others were exerting pressure to examine what kind of Home Rule Bill was to be presented when office was regained. Gladstone tried to resist such pressure, arguing that the framing of a Bill should be left until the time came.

In particular, Rosebery and his supporters wanted the position of the Irish members after Home Rule reversed. The 1886 Bill had proposed to exclude the Irish from Westminster. This question was recognised as one of the most difficult of the whole issue, and one which gave the Unionists good opportunities for criticism whichever way it was decided. Rosebery made notes of 2 long discussions on the problem in 1890: one with Gladstone at Hawarden, and the other a meeting of the 1886 Cabinet (48).

Rosebery was pressing hard for the retention of at least some Irish members after Home Rule. Many of the Scottish Home Rulers, of course, were pursuing the same line, and Rosebery's established position as a general devolutionist would have inclined him towards the argument. More significant by this time, however, was his imperial

enthusiasm and his belief in the long term possibilities of Imperial Federation. To provide a better focus and central point for the Empire, and to keep alive the idea of Imperial Federation, Westminster would need to continue to reflect the whole British Isles. The argument about the exclusion or retention of the Irish members had little to do with Ireland. It had to do with concepts of Liberalism: Rosebery and his friends were taking a nationalist measure and trying to turn it into an imperialist measure. Ferguson wrote to Rosebery: "If we had only made our start on that line, instead of on the parochial, how much healthier matters would be" (49).

Early in 1891 Rosebery's study of William Pitt the Younger was published. Pitt, the first of 4 biographies he was to write, was generally well received, and letters of congratulation and enthusiasm poured in from friends and colleagues. To a modern reader it is an odd and often rather turgid book which, curiously, seems to lack the fluency and style of Rosebery's speeches. The book is of interest here for what he wrote of Pitt and the Irish union.

He opened the chapter on the union with a ferocious attack on the method by which the measure was put through the Irish parliament.

> The corruption was black, hideous, horrible; revolting at any time, atrocious when it is remembered that it was a nation's birthright that was being sold.

But he went on to add that "it must in fairness be remembered that this was the only method known of carrying

on Irish government, the only means of passing any measure through the Irish parliament".

He defended Pitt's action in pushing through the Union on 2 counts. First, he was acting in a time of national emergency during the war with France, it was vital to him that Britain and Ireland should present a united front. The 1798 rebellion and minor French support for it had shown that. Secondly, Pitt always intended to accompany the Union with reforms, principally Catholic Emancipation and the abolition of tithes. This he was unable to do. Rosebery speculated that if it had been possible for him to put through the reforms as well, the Union might have worked successfully. But he was not by this just offering comfort to present-day Unionists:

> The ruinous part (of Pitt's overall policy) that remains, exposed as it has been to the harshest storms of nine decades, is judged and venerated as if it were the entire structure (50).

In October 1891 Parnell died. In the negotiations surrounding Parnell's removal from the leadership of the Irish Party Rosebery had played no part. His speech on the Special Commission was his last public reference to Parnell during the latter's lifetime, and the dinner at the Eighty Club was probably the only occasion on which the 2 met. It has been argued here that in the early stages of his career, Rosebery to some extent modelled himself on Parnell, both consciously and unconsciously. There could never have been any direct reference to this by Rosebery: in the early 1880s Parnell was far from a popular figure in Liberal circles, and by

the time Parnell was respectable and attractive to Liberals, Rosebery was no longer seeing himself just as a territorial spokesman.

There is, however, a little evidence from a later period of the interest Rosebery had taken in Parnell's career. In November 1898 he wrote to Lord Spencer that he had just got R. Barry O'Brien's recently published Life of Parnell. He said that he had been fascinated by the account of Parnell's career, "Captivated by it", and had read it for 8 hours at a sitting (51). The same month he delivered his presidential address to the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution. His paper was devoted mainly to Gladstone, but included a section on Parnell. He described Parnell as "icy, silent, superstitious, concentrated, a political enigma of the profoundest interest", and speculated:

> For ten years Mr. Parnell filled the largest space in Mr. Gladstone's public life, perhaps in English public life: his position in his own country it is unnecessary to define or describe. What was the secret of this prodigious success? It has never been revealed, perhaps it never will be, perhaps it never can be (52).

It is also worth adding that it could plausibly be suggested that the collapse of Parnell's career, and then his death, contributed to Rosebery's decision to pull back from Irish Home Rule. He was isolated in the Lords, and knew none of the Irish leaders: the disappearance of the only Irish politician he had identified with, albeit covertly, can only have turned him further away from a policy he had always had grave doubts about.

Parliament was dissolved in June 1892 after 6 years of Tory rule. The general election saw the last of the 5 Midlothian campaigns. It was a less happy occasion than the previous campaigns. When Gladstone came to Dalmeny Rosebery was gloomy, suffering from a bad cold and muttering continuously about retiring from public life. Though the Liberals returned to power Gladstone's own majority in Midlothian was considerably cut. His parliamentary majority was 40, including Irish votes, and he sadly described it as "too small, too small" (53). Gladstone took office without enthusiasm and without much encouragement from Rosebery who seemed to be taking a gloomy satisfaction in the general depression. Gladstone certainly took office without the blessing of his sovereign who described him as "an old, wild and incomprehensible man of 82½" (54).

Rosebery was again offered the Foreign Office and, after considerable hesitation, accepted. He entered office glumly protesting that he would rather have retired but, once there found the work, as in 1886, congenial. Again he was left relatively to himself, Gladstone being more than ever bound up with Ireland. When the Prime Minister did try and interfere in foreign relations, over Uganda, Rosebery brushed him aside and threatened resignation. Gladstone noted sadly in 1893 that "of all the blunders which he had ever committed, the one for which he had the least excuse was the appointment of Lord Rosebery as Foreign Secretary" (55). Their relationship had deteriorated a long way since the cheerful days of 1879.

The main business of 1892 was the drafting of the second Home Rule Bill, to be introduced in 1893. In this process Haldane played a minor part: he was used as an adviser on constitutional law by John Morley. Rosebery played no part, sticking to the foreign office. He was not put on the Cabinet committee to draft the Bill, and in general Cabinet discussion he contributed little. One of Rosebery's biographers recounts this anecdote which was symptomatic:

> When the Home Rule Bill was discussed by the Cabinet on November 21st., he and Harcourt sat ostentatiously apart on a sofa, and when Spencer approached they waved him away with the remark, 'Oh no, this is the English bench' (56).

The battle over the retention of the Irish members being won, Rosebery clearly decided to distance himself as much as possible from the Irish measure. He was already looking to the future of Liberalism after Gladstone. After 6 years of opposition the party had returned to power dispirited and pessimistic. Rosebery believed that a new phase of Liberalism was needed and to inaugurate it the Irish policy would have to be dropped. As we have seen, he was never an enthusiast in the Home Rule cause. He had now become convinced that it would be necessary to abandon the cast-iron commitment to Home Rule, rejuvenate the party over domestic reform, and perhaps return with some sort of fairly minor federalist scheme. But with Gladstone setting forth again to propose Home Rule Rosebery was hardly in a position to expound his ideas publicly. He could see that he had a good chance of the succession, he could see that the Bill would fail; and so he elected to keep himself busy in the

foreign office except when called on, and to distance himself from Home Rule.

Gladstone took up the great challenge again on February 13 1893, introducing the second Home Rule Bill in the Commons. He kept the House in session throughout the summer and the Bill eventually secured a third reading in the early hours of September 2. Haldane made one major speech in April on the second reading. He replied to a speech by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach and concentrated on the form of Home Rule, the constitutional aspect. He ridiculed Hicks-Beach's suggestion of an Irish executive responsible to the Imperial parliament. The idea was both unworkable and totally foreign to the British constitution. He said that he saw Home Rule as granting the type of government that worked well in Canada or Australia or, nearer at hand, in the Isle of Man or the Channel Islands. There was no question of the Union being repealed; rather it would be strengthened and the Westminster parliament would remain supreme. He doubted though that there would ever be the need for a British government to interfere with the decisions reached by an Irish parliament.

He referred to Ulster. He said he was well aware of the cries of "No Popery" but felt that the days of religious bigotry should be long gone. There would never be any question of the Catholic majority wishing to persecute the northern minority and the responsible sections of the opposition knew it. Anyway, knowing Ulstermen as he did,

he was in no doubt that they would be able to look after themselves in an Irish parliament (57).

The speech was a sound one and went down well. Indeed, as Haldane wrote to his mother, to whom if no-one else he could show off a little:

> I had a great success in the House last night. The papers, though they are pretty full of it, cannot deal with it adequately, as the speech was delivered in reply to Sir Michael Beach's, was chiefly occupied with an alehouse constitutional argument (sic). It took an hour and ten minutes to deliver, when it was over Davitt, Blake, O'Brien and other Irish leaders came across the floor to thank me and congratulate me. One of them said touchingly 'I could live and die for a man like you'. Even the Parnellites came - I had spoken of the debt Ireland owed to 'the great Irishman who eighteen months before was laid to sleep in Glasnevin Cemetery' and old Colonel Nolan came to me with tears in his eyes. Mr. G. was not there but John Morley and his colleagues thanked me personally. Even the Tories poured in congratulations - the speaker said to someone 'a very good constitutional speech' and John Burns declared that he could hear the silence with which it was listened to, and that it was the finest speech for Home Rule that he had heard. So I came off pretty well (58).

There was something mildly amusing about Haldane so enhancing his reputation in defence of a cause he was so doubtful about. But he was a good lawyer, making principally a legal speech despite the flourishes, so it behoved him to make a good case whatever his personal reservations. The speech restored him to favour, for 2 months later he was writing to his mother: "I am seeing a good deal of Mr. Gladstone privately on the Bill. He consults me in quite a fatherly way now". His letters also revealed his frustration as the Bill dragged on through the summer. He kept putting back the date of his trip to Scotland: "I have

arranged to pair as from the third reading of the Irish Bill. This will let me away about the 20th. of August. I wish it could be earlier" he wrote in July. In August it was: "We are slowly dragging on with this Bill. It should be done soon" (59).

The Bill passed the Commons after 7 months of debate. It took the Lords less than a week to reject it by 419 votes to 41. Rosebery spoke on the third day of the Lords' debate. In May he had set out his considered views on Home Rule in a private letter to the Queen. The Queen found Rosebery among the least objectionable of her Liberal Ministers and believed, rightly, that he was not keen on the measure. She therefore poured out her violent dislike of the Bill to him in her own dramatic style. Rosebery replied at length, in the third person as was customary.

> He is not an enthusiastic Home Ruler, in the sense of believing that it is a certain panacea for the secular ills of Ireland; nor would he pursue that remedy to the length of civil war, for of course it would be then worse than the disease it is designed to cure. But he regards it as on the whole the most practicable or least impracticable method of governing that country and, indeed, until it shall have been tried, he knows of no alternative: for he believes that were the hope of Home Rule to be removed the latent forces of anarchy and revolution would break out with renewed horror. He considers therefore that the Government have no choice but to go on with their measure, to which they are pledged in honour, and which a majority of the House of Commons supports. It will no doubt be rejected by the House of Lords, and the result of that rejection remains to be seen.... Lord Rosebery deplores Your Majesty's misgivings and distress, the more so as he can fully enter into Your Majesty's point of view.... Indeed he is not sure that he does not consider the London County Council a more portentous circumstance than an Irish local legislature (60).

This was a very remarkable letter for one of the chief ministers to have written of the central measure of his own government. Had Gladstone seen it he would no doubt have been extremely angry. He was in fact soon to see a version of it in even more remarkable circumstances: Rosebery's speech in the Bill's favour in the Lords.

It was one of his most urbane and masterly efforts. He made great sport of the difficulty of speaking for an act which everyone knew the House was going to reject.

> Somewhere, in the passage, in that short lobby that leads from the House of Commons to the House of Lords, this Bill caught its death of some passing chill, and it is, if I may say so humbly, an interesting but an academic discussion, unreal in every part and particle of it, to which we have been listening for the last three days.

He went on to compare, in humorous vein, the scene before him to a Spanish bull-fight, with the Home Rule Bill as the bull and Salisbury as matador.

Turning to his own views, he said:

> You may be certain, in regard to this controversy, of the infallibility of the course you have pursued or propose to pursue. I may frankly say that I am by no means sure of mine. I am not certain about anything with regard to Ireland.... I myself would have preferred some scheme of devolution which would have been applicable to all countries alike in the United Kingdom, ... but you cannot get all you want.

And in a passage that was to become famous he declared:

> I speak as a witness, but not an enthusiastic witness, in favour of Home Rule. With me, at any rate, for I am speaking for one moment of myself, Home Rule is not a fanaticism; it is not a question of sentiment; it is scarcely even a question of history. It is not a counsel of perfection; but it is on the whole the best of the courses to be pursued in dealing with a highly critical and complex subject (61).

A contemporary observer wrote of this speech:

> It was a considerable feat of political dexterity to 'speak columns' on the Bill without saying anything about it. More dexterous than prudent (62).

Certainly the speech lacked both substance and conviction. Salisbury, in winding up the debate for the opposition, said that Rosebery's attitude had been "How shall I get through an hour and a quarter's speech without undertaking any pledge which may be inconvenient to me in the future?" (63). Many Liberals were horrified at the casual disdain with which Rosebery had seemed to imply he regarded Home Rule. Gladstone, whom he had called by implication a fanatic, was disappointed and furious.

After the defeat of the Bill, the government eventually decided not to resign. But it soon became apparent that Gladstone was going to retire. Now in his mid-80s and having failed over Ireland, he had neither the stamina nor the inclination to deal with the day-to-day running of the country. The party believed there were only 2 possible successors: Rosebery or Harcourt. Gladstone himself probably favoured Lord Spencer; he had a considerable aversion for Harcourt and his opinion of Rosebery had been falling continuously for some 10 years. Given that no-one else was seriously considering Spencer, Gladstone plumped for Rosebery. So did the Queen who became even more excited than usual at the prospect of Sir William Harcourt as her Prime Minister. In March 1894 Rosebery became the Prime Minister.

In theory Rosebery had reached the summit of his ambitions. The mantle of Gladstone had fallen to him and he was now premier. In practice he was to hold the office for only 16 months, and they were to be disastrous. Harcourt was disappointed and resentful; he had become the leader in the Commons and resolved to lead with the minimum of reference to the Prime Minister. The radical wing of the party was outraged at having a peer in charge of a Liberal government. The party and the government were demoralised: their parliamentary majority was too small, their only major piece of legislation had been rejected and there was every indication that the public did not care about that rejection, about Home Rule, or about the government. In Winston Churchill's vivid phrase, Rosebery came into "a bleak, precarious, wasting inheritance" (64).

Much of the trouble came from Rosebery himself. He complained that he was unable to assert any authority or control over his colleagues, but there is little evidence that he really tried. He continued to spread around the impression that he had not wanted the job anyway, though the hard negotiating that went on with Harcourt and Morley before the successor to Gladstone was announced showed that he was willing enough. He had definite ideas as to how he wished to see Liberalism develop after Gladstone: as a progressive and imperialist moderate party as far removed from its own extreme radicals as from old-fashioned Tories. When the opportunity came for leadership, he naturally took it. After his disastrous period as Prime Minister, it was

equally natural that he should portray himself as the reluctant public servant, doing his duty against his personal wishes.

Rosebery had actually written a memo on the reasons why he should not be Prime Minister a week before taking office. It included the following objection to his promotion.

> I have lived in my office (i.e. the foreign office) in absolute obscurity - only making one political speech (and that not voluntarily). It was on the Home Rule Bill in the House of Lords and, having to make it, I made such declarations and confessions in it as would I hoped put an end for ever to the possibility of my being even considered for the Prime Ministership (65).

This memo made it clear that far from being misconstrued the year before, Rosebery was making a bid for freedom. But, despite his protestations, it is easier to believe that it was a bid for freedom from the Irish policy than a bid for freedom from the premiership. In addressing the party before taking up his duties in parliament he admitted that "it would be affectation to deny that a speech of mine in the House of Lords last year has raised some doubts as to my position on that question (i.e. Ireland)". But, he added, "we are bound by every tie of honour and of policy" to Home Rule, a declaration that cannot have really done much to dissipate the doubts (66).

In any event, the same afternoon he increased the doubts to a new level. He was making his first speech in the Lords as Prime Minister. Salisbury welcomed Rosebery to his new position, and in the course of a longish speech remarked that Home Rule was now suspended and its future would depend

on its acceptance or rejection by England. Rosebery replied, opening by paying a tribute to Gladstone. Turning to Ireland he denied that the government wished to evade the problem and pointing out that there was no mention of Home Rule in the Queen's speech simply because there was no intention of introducing a Home Rule Bill in the current session. It was not after all "the mere function of the House of Commons to prepare and pass Bills simply in order to furnish sport for the House of Lords". They could have called an election but there was no reason why they should: their measure had passed the Commons and "we will never concede the right to this hereditary House to enforce a dissolution".

Rosebery then went on to say, as he had the year before, that he still hoped for some form of Home Rule all round eventually. He continued:

> The noble Marquis made one remark on the subject of Irish Home Rule with which I confess myself in entire accord. He said that before Irish Home Rule is conceded by the Imperial Parliament, England, as the predominant member of the partnership of the three Kingdoms, will have to be convinced of its justice. That may seem to be a considerable admission to make, because your lordships will know that the majority of English members of Parliament, elected from England proper, are hostile to Home Rule. But I believe that the conviction of England in regard to Home Rule depends on one point alone, and that is the conduct of Ireland herself (67).

This declaration caused a sensation, and consternation in the Liberal and Irish ranks. Rosebery was accused of apostasy and in wild scenes in the Commons the next day the address was defeated by 2 votes, some Irish and radical

members voting against the government. Morley recounted that Rosebery claimed it had been a slip of the tongue.

> 'I blurted it out', he said. 'For heaven's sake', said I, 'blurt out what you please about any country in the whole world, civilised or barbarous, except Ireland. Irish affairs are the very last field for that practice' (68).

Rosebery was assailed with ferocity by John Redmond who described the statement as "preposterous and insulting to the Irish people" and issued a manifesto:

> In Lord Rosebery and his present Cabinet we can have no confidence, and we warn our fellow-countrymen to have none: they will concede just as much to Ireland as she extorts by organisation among her people and absolute unfettered independence of English parties in her representatives (69).

Redmond at this time was leader only of the small Parnellite group in parliament and was currently appealing to the more extreme shades of Irish opinion. The anti-Parnellite majority were more merciful. John Dillon agreed to appear at a meeting 5 days later in Edinburgh, when Rosebery attempted an explanation. It was a weak speech, in which he claimed that what he had said was merely a platitude, since it was obvious that more English votes would be needed to push through Home Rule. Constitutionally, this was not true since the Liberals had got a Commons majority in 1893, and it was naive to suppose that the Lords would have passed Home Rule if it had achieved a larger majority. The implications of what he had said were that no measure affecting Ireland, Scotland or Wales could be put through without English acquiescence. This was directly contrary to Gladstone's point that Home Rule was morally encumbent

on parliament precisely because a majority of Irish opinion wanted it. In Edinburgh Rosebery again made reference to the desirability of Home Rule all round; but, after the statement of the need for English agreement, this can have been of no more comfort to federalist Scots than it was to Irishmen (70).

A month later Rosebery made an appeal to the Liberal Unionists to consider returning to the party, in the Liberal Magazine. He suggested to them "that the chapter in the party's history constituted by the Home Rule preoccupation was now closed" and that the party had changed with a new enthusiasm for "interest in our Empire" (71). It has been argued here that Rosebery had lost whatever enthusiasm he ever had for Irish Home Rule by 1892. Since then he had adopted a policy of dropping Home Rule by stealth and implication. It had not been a great success. When he spoke on the Bill in 1893, he was of course one of Mr. Gladstone's ministers. He therefore used a tactic of damning the Bill with faint praise. The memorandum on the succession to Gladstone that he wrote shows that he believed that he had made his position clear. But he had not, he had merely created strong doubts; and part of the reason why he had not made himself clearer was that he was not sure enough of being Gladstone's successor to dare to speak directly against Gladstone's most cherished measure.

When he did become Prime Minister, he continued the same line. Redmond and others correctly realised that he was

asking for the abandonment of Home Rule, but Rosebery pulled back from actually saying so definitely. He pretended to Morley, for example, that his speech in the Lords on taking office had been an unfortunate mistake. Undoubtedly it would have been difficult for Rosebery, who never had a firm grip on the party, to have immediately demanded the dropping of Home Rule. But the course he had chosen left the party uncertain and confused and further weakened the demoralised and dispirited government he had inherited.

Rosebery took no further interest in Ireland during his premiership. His letters to the Chief Secretary for Ireland, John Morley, show this. In December 1894 he wrote whimsically: "I envy you the serene quietude of your pacified Emerald Isle". The next month he wrote: "I do not know what you have on the stocks in the way of legislation"; while in May 1895 it was:

> I find myself in an unusually lamentable state of ignorance about Irish matters.... The election of the Lord Lieutenant to the Jockey Club is the only circumstance affecting the Irish government of which I am cognizant (72).

The Queen's speech for 1895 had dealt with Ireland in 2 paragraphs. A minor change in the land laws was proposed; otherwise there was only this for the Queen to say:

> I am happy to observe the striking fact that in Ireland offences of all kinds against the law have sunk during the past year to the lowest level hitherto marked in official records (73).

One of the few achievements of the Rosebery government was the appointment of a Scottish Grand Committee to consider

Scottish legislation, described in chapter 2. This was a concession to Scottish grievance and nationalism. Trevelyan, the Scottish Secretary, only succeeded in getting the proposal through for one year, but nonetheless Rosebery's administration had done something for his native country and old power-base. In June 1895, still squabbling and divided, the government was defeated on a snap vote. It was a vote of censure on Campbell-Bannerman, the war minister, over an alleged lack of cordite. It was a freak vote on an unimportant question and by no standards a vote of confidence, but Rosebery eagerly took the chance offered and resigned.

The Liberals entered the election that followed resignation in utter disarray. John Morley insisted on carrying the Gladstonian banner and campaigned on Home Rule, Harcourt campaigned on local option mixed with no positive policy at all. Rosebery decided on reform of the Lords to rouse the populace: they all failed singularly to do so and the Tories were returned with a majority of 152. Rosebery had made one great set piece speech during the campaign, in the Albert Hall on July 5. The bulk of the speech was devoted to the topic of Lords' reform. On Ireland he re-iterated the point he had made in the Queen's speech; "In all its history Ireland was never so tranquil, never so contented as she is at the present". He paid a generous tribute to the Irish party for their parliamentary support and to John Morley for his administration of Irish affairs; it had been "vigilant, ... just, ... and sympathetic". His remarks on

the tranquility of Ireland were not disinterested: in the Gladstonian view such tranquillity was supposed to be impossible without Home Rule. His claim that Ireland was now in that state and that she had "confidence in the Liberal administration" implied that there was now no need for Home Rule.

In his closing peroration he made another of his veiled calls for the abandonment of Home Rule.

> We retract none of our pledges. We stand committed, as we have always stood committed, to our pledges. We have still on our banner the construction of an Irish legislature for distinctively Irish affairs.... We do not retire from any of our pledges, but we do want in future a little air and elbow-room. We do not, I repeat, retire from any of our pledges, but we ask you to have confidence in the Liberal leaders as to when, as to how, and as to the order in which those pledges should be redeemed (74).

By this stage it was difficult for anyone to believe that Rosebery did not want "elbow-room" to push Home Rule quietly into the background.

> My only interest has been in individual elections like yours, for the general catastrophe was under the circumstances certain and inevitable (75).

Rosebery writing to Asquith in July 1895; by any standards an extraordinary letter for a party leader to write. Rosebery took a gloomy satisfaction in the electoral disaster. For he and his advisers had convinced themselves that it was not Rosebery who was being rejected by the people but Home Rule and radical Liberalism. Munro Ferguson sent Rosebery a long letter on his analysis of the defeat at the polls. He identified several causes, including the weakness of Rosebery's position as Prime Minister and the

disloyalty of Harcourt. Also significant, he wrote, was the fact that

> We were kept to Mr. G's H R instead of being able to give sufficient definite assurances upon H R all round under effective control by the Central Parliament (76).

After Rosebery's performance as Prime Minister on the subject of Ireland, it seems remarkable to blame electoral defeat on close adherence to Home Rule. But the Roseberyites, who had never displayed a burning enthusiasm for Home Rule, were now convinced that it was the unceasing and unreasoning attachment to Gladstone's policy that had alienated them from the electorate. They were thus not too cast down by the defeat, which they felt gave the opportunity for a re-assessment and re-alignment of Liberal policies. If the party would but follow Rosebery the mass of sensible and moderate electors could be regained. A reasoning imperialism would replace an insular radicalism, and a modest degree of general devolution would replace the vote-losing fanaticism of Home Rule.

In October 1895 Rosebery wrote to Munro Ferguson:

> I must under my own hand make an announcement to you that will, I fear, give you pain. I have resigned the leadership of the Liberal Party (77).

His resignation came unexpectedly in a letter to the chief whip, Tom Ellis. His position in the party had not improved in the year since they had left government, with Harcourt continuing to act as an independent leader. To complete Rosebery's woes, Gladstone had suddenly emerged again from his retirement in the late summer to denounce, with all his

old fervour, a massacre of Armenians in Turkey. This was Gladstone at his most evangelical. Rosebery did not agree with Gladstone over the matter and also felt, justifiably, that the return of the grand old man to the political arena, made his leadership of the party still more nominal only. He wrote to Ellis that Gladstone had, without intending it, hopelessly undermined his position, and he could not carry on when he received so little "explicit support" (78).

Rosebery made a brilliant and dramatic speech of farewell in Edinburgh a few days later. He dealt at length with his disagreement with Gladstone over the massacres; of Ireland he said nothing. He closed a speech which had been received with all the old enthusiasm of the early Midlothian campaigns by saying that it pleased him to be able to say goodbye "in mine own ancient city, among my own neighbours, my own fellow-citizens, my own friends" (79).

Asquith, who spoke immediately after Rosebery, told the audience that he had little doubt that they would soon see Rosebery restored to the leadership of the party where he belonged (80). In fact, Rosebery was never to hold office again. But he did not intend to leave politics, and he certainly did intend to return to the leadership. This was a planned withdrawal and part of the campaign to change the nature of Liberalism. Haldane wrote to his mother "it is only the beginning of the battle but a battle which we hope to win" (81). One of Rosebery's closest advisers of the decade after 1895, Sir Thomas Wemyss Reid, endorsed

Rosebery's approach to Home Rule:

> On the other hand I have not met a single man who does not agree that Home Rule of the type of Mr. G is dead. They do not think it well to say so however.... It strengthens my belief that you should not be the first to attack the Irish, but should rather leave it for outsiders to take up (82).

Another new friend and adviser, Sir Robert Perks, believed that Rosebery should firmly come out against Home Rule. Perks himself was one of the few Liberals who were actually doing so publicly by this time, and he wrote to Rosebery, on the day his resignation was announced:

> The Liberal party cannot be rebuilt upon a Welsh-Irish foundation.... I hope you will speak clearly tomorrow upon the Liberal-Irish alliance. That will be one of the advantages of your new-found freedom (83).

As we have seen Rosebery did not take Perks' advice. He preferred to follow Wemyss Reid's line and leave it for others, such as Perks himself, to explicitly condemn Home Rule. It was to be several years before Rosebery directly attacked the party's Irish policy in his speeches. For the next 3 years, indeed, he took little part in political activities. He continued to fulfil various public engagements, but they tended to be of the non-partisan and elder statesman variety. There was, for example, the address already noted on Gladstone and Parnell: "Statesmen and Bookmen". He spent large parts of these years abroad, in a villa he had bought near Naples. He left it to his lieutenants to work on Liberalism and awaited the call to return to lead. With hindsight, we can see that this was a mistake. However much his supporters could do, to establish a firm hold on the party Rosebery needed to be seen to be available and active.

Rosebery's most active parliamentary supporters continued to include Haldane and Munro Ferguson. Haldane had not joined Rosebery's government. He had been tempted by the offer of the Scottish Solicitor Generalship, but the offer had been withdrawn in favour of the Board of Trade. This was in fact a higher post, but Haldane had decided he was not yet ready for office and wished to continue to spend a good deal of his time on his legal work. He had also been offered the Speakership by Rosebery; though flattered, he did not wish to end the purely political part of his career, and politely declined. Ferguson Rosebery had appointed Scottish whip as soon as he became Prime Minister. Previously Ferguson had served as his parliamentary private secretary in the Foreign Office. But he was not destined for higher office for many years: he was too close to Rosebery to be promoted by Campbell-Bannerman. Asquith made him a Privy Councillor in 1910 and sent him to Australia as Governor-General in 1914. Rosebery paid Ferguson a generous tribute in his Edinburgh resignation speech.

> May I say one word also to another colleague, outside the Cabinet indeed, but who has been nearer to me than some who were inside? I mean your neighbour, Mr. Munro Ferguson of Novar. Since he has been in public life our fortunes have been closely united; we have been rather like elder brother and younger brother than like Minister and secretary, or like two political friends; and it is a pleasure to me at this solemn moment that I have the opportunity of offering him my heartfelt thanks for all that he has done for me and been to me in my political career (84).

Rosebery, however, had his reservations about Ferguson's political abilities. He described him to Wemyss Reid as "a

devoted though perhaps not always judicious friend of mine". Unlike Haldane, who maintained his own career while looking to Rosebery as a leader, Ferguson was only a Roseberyite; and if Rosebery had his doubts about him, it was not surprising that elsewhere in the party he was not regarded as a suitable potential minister (85).

In 1898 Haldane became involved in another aspect of the Irish question: higher education. He had, more than any other of the Roseberyites, kept up his interest in social reform. He had become close to the Webbs and friendly with Bernard Shaw and other Fabians, though officially never of their number. With Sidney Webb he also shared an abiding interest in the promotion of university education. Together they had drawn up a scheme to turn London University from a mere examining body into a full teaching university. Haldane brought this scheme to the Commons and succeeded, on his third attempt, in getting it passed. One of the problems he encountered was the determination of some of the Irish members, principally Dillon and Healy, to use his Bill to draw attention to the need for improved university education for Irish Catholics. Haldane had got an assurance from Balfour that the government would not oppose the London scheme, and was persuaded by the Irish to try and draft a plan for Irish university education on denominational grounds.

His promise to Healy and Dillon was the price he had to pay to remove their opposition to the London Bill. It was not

just a question of political bargaining for Haldane though; his commitment to the extension of university education was as genuine in the case of Ireland, as it had been in the case of London. He encouraged Dillon to bring the Irish grievance over universities before the Commons, and spoke warmly in his support:

> The question before the House is, substantially, whether the Catholics of Ireland, four-fifths of the population of the island, are to go without university education.... It is no use saying they can go to the universities, for experience has proved that they won't go.... When I think of the difference between my own country of Scotland and the condition of things that exist in Ireland in this matter I am ashamed. Hon. Members sometimes speak - I don't think that they really speak deliberately after having considered it - but they speak lightly of a university education as if it was a sort of luxury. Well, I can only say, speaking from my own knowledge, that it represents the life and backbone of the people of Scotland (86).

Balfour was again consulted about the plan to look into the possibilities for reform in Ireland, and was agreeable. In October 1898 Haldane visited Ireland. He kept in close touch with Balfour, but he went of course purely as a private member, the Unionist government could give him no official brief. He went too without any great encouragement from his own party. John Morley, the party spokesman on matters Irish, wrote to warn him that he was involving himself in questions more complicated than he perhaps realised.

> I don't know if your notion of an Irish visit ripens.... Let me warn you that even the Bishops are not all of them very keen, as I am told. They suspect that their foe, the Jesuit means to get hold of the thing, when it is set up: and so he does. I must say, for my part, I doubt if these relations will be improved by any active demonstration of party interest in a R. C. college; because it is sure to stir up the Noncoms,

> both in the H. of C. and the constituencies.... Of course, this is no reason why you, as a private member should not master the question.... Only remember that these are deep and turbid waters, unlike the limpid pool of the London Univ! (87).

Morley's point about the British Nonconformists was a valid one. Rosebery was to get a letter from Perks, a Nonconformist spokesman as well as a Roseberyite, saying that Nonconformity was horrified at the proposal for a Catholic university in Ireland and would campaign vigorously that there should be "no public money for sectarian uses" (88).

Haldane was unversed in the niceties of Irish religious politics, and undeterred. His direct approach paid off; he enjoyed his trip and was surprisingly successful. The plan was to create 2 teaching universities, one in Dublin and one in Belfast. These would leave Trinity College untouched but incorporate the old Royal University. The universities were

> to have open Constitutions, i.e., not to be stamped denominational in the face of their Constitutions, but to be de facto, though not de jure, the one Catholic and the other Protestant.

For in Ireland "undenominationalism is practically impossible" (89).

Haldane found general agreement to his scheme. He saw first the Vice-Chancellor of the Royal University, then officials of the Jesuit College and Chief Baron Palles. He knew however that, even with the encouragement of those involved in higher education, it was the attitude of the churches that would be crucial. He travelled to Belfast, "this strange stronghold", to meet with the Principal of

Queen's College and representatives of the Presbyterian General Assembly. Here he had "less difficulty than I expected" (90), for, though unhappy about any plan which would include the establishment of a Catholic university, the Presbyterian leaders were dissatisfied with the existing situation. They warned him there would be Orange opposition but did not consider it would be overwhelming.

Meanwhile the Catholic bishops had met at Maynooth, and had deputed Archbishop Walsh to see Haldane. Walsh reported that the hierarchy, too, was generally favourable. They would have liked to have seen a proper Catholic university "the Statutes of which should have been approved in Rome", but "they were quite aware it was hopeless to expect the Government to try to establish such a university". They were, therefore, prepared to sanction Haldane's scheme. They accepted that the majority of the governing body of the southern university would need to be laymen, provided "that that Governing Body should consist of persons agreeable to them, and some of their own members should be upon it". They would also require safeguards for the removal of any teachers who might prove doctrinally "obnoxious" to the church (91).

Walsh warned Haldane, however, that he feared Cardinal Logue was against the scheme. Haldane therefore went to see Logue, armed with an introduction from Walsh and a letter recommending the plan from Tim Healy. Logue in fact also declared himself in favour; as Haldane wrote to his mother with pride.

> Well - I have cleared my last hurdle, and return having accomplished what no Irish Secretary has ever succeeded in doing - and what Mr. Gladstone failed over - the Irish Hierarchy - the Nationalist party - and the Irish Presbyterian leaders in Belfast have been brought to agree on a scheme for Irish University Education.
>
> I crossed my last hurdle with toes in the air. I left Dublin with the warning of the Archbishop that I should probably fail with Cardinal Logue the Primate. I descended on him at Armagh, and in half an hour we had settled everything in accordance with my scheme, and were settling down - he in his red hat and I - over two dozen oysters (it is Friday) and a bottle of champagne. If the Government have any pluck - of which I am not sure - we ought to succeed now in solving this great problem (92).

Haldane returned to London well pleased with himself and contacted Balfour. He drew up the memorandum for Balfour with a full account of the negotiations, and started work on drafting charters for the 2 universities. But, as he had feared, having had surprising success in Ireland, he had less success in Britain. It began to emerge that the Government did not have sufficient "pluck". A month after his return from Ireland he wrote to his mother:

> I also hope very much that the Govt. will let Arthur Balfour and his brother who both want to, follow out the Irish scheme. But I am not sure that they will. There are some men among them who are both narrow and timid (93).

A week later he discovered.

> I went with Mr. Balfour to Panshanger - we had a reserved compartment and he told me what had happened... The Cabinet rejected his plan - not because they did not approve of the scheme, which was fully before them, but because of the fear of the effect in the Unionist constituencies.... Of course neither he nor I are more than checked for the time, but a great chance has been lost. He feels this bitterly, I minded less than he did (94).

It seemed that the Unionists were as wary of public funding for a Catholic university as were the Liberals, even though it was to be nominally undenominational. Nonetheless, with Balfour's permission Haldane sent the draft charters to Archbishop Walsh. He too was losing enthusaism. He wrote to Haldane at length: the Hierarchy now felt the charter did not give the church sufficient control over the southern university, and they no longer favoured the idea of the 2 new universities being set up at the same time and by the same Bill (95).

The question was not, however, completely dead, and it seems sensible to give the rest of the story here. Haldane was proud of what he had so nearly achieved and did not the matter drop. In October 1901 he spoke in Liverpool on "Great Britain and Germany: A Study in Education". In this speech he outlined his scheme; everyone would know that in practice his universities would be respectively Catholic and Protestant. But he argued that was not really such a terrible thing.

> We may regret this, but we cannot help it, and it is no reason for denying what would at all events be new light in the dark places in Ireland. After all, Ireland is not the only country where education has to take its chance in the struggle with prejudice (96).

He returned briefly to it in a major speech on the future of Liberalism delivered in 1904: "Constructive Liberalism". By this time he had ceased to believe that Balfour had done his best to persuade his colleagues to back the scheme and he bitterly criticised Balfour for failure to press the

plan or take the issue seriously (97). At the end of 1905 the Liberals returned to power under Campbell-Bannerman. Haldane was appointed War Minister and devoted most of his time to army reform. The Campbell-Bannerman government did not spend a great deal of time on Ireland but, to Haldane's delight, did settle the university question.

James Bryce was the Irish Secretary and, as Haldane put it in his Autobiography "tried his hand" at the university problem. Haldane's account continues:

> But whether he had not heard of the negotiations of 1898, or whether he disliked the plan, he took a different course. Along with Sir Antony Macdonell, the Permanent Under-Secretary for Ireland, he devised a plan for reforming and expanding the University of Dublin so that it might provide for the necessities of the Catholic population. I had not been consulted and knew nothing of this plan, otherwise I should have pronounced it to be hopelessly inadequate. It proved to be so. Neither Trinity College nor the Hierarchy would look at it. Bryce, however, at this time became our Ambassador to Washington, and Birrell succeeded him in the Irish Secretaryship. The latter reported to us who were his colleagues that he found the question of Irish university reform in a hopeless condition. I asked him in the Cabinet whether he had looked at the agreed scheme of 1898. He knew nothing of it, and three days later reported that there were no papers to be found dealing with it. I then produced my own copies of the documents, and on further enquiry the Irish government discovered that they had copies of their own which they had overlooked. Birrell at once communicated with the Hierarchy and also with the Belfast Assembly. Both replied that they adhered to the agreement come to years earlier (98).

Presumably the Bishops overcame their reservations at the Haldane plan because it was so much better than what Bryce had proposed. The charters Haldane had drafted were dusted off and slightly modified, and a Bill was drawn up and passed. Haldane was in the almost unique position of seeing the Irish reform he really cared about passed into law.

To return to the late 1890s, in December 1898 Sir William Harcourt finally retired and gave up the leadership of the Liberals. After some hesitation, and somewhat to its own surprise, the party chose Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman to succeed him. Campbell-Bannerman was a kindly and likeable moderate radical, easy-going and not lightly disturbed, he nonetheless did hold strong views from which he was not to be moved. He had a quite different view of Liberalism from Rosebery. Campbell-Bannerman had little time for militant imperialism, being more in the "little England" Liberal tradition. He was essentially a pragmatic politician within a framework of mid-Victorian middle-class radicalism and distrusted the politics of theory and programme. Personally, he and Rosebery were on friendly but distant terms until 1900; thereafter they found each other increasingly irritating.

Unfortunately for Campbell-Bannerman, and for Liberalism, it soon emerged that while Harcourt had given up the leadership, he had not really retired. In addition, John Morley, who was piqued that no-one but himself had considered him for the leadership, frequently took an independent line. And from 1899 Rosebery too began to creep slowly back into the limelight. Liberalism thus had 4 leaders, and they were often at loggerheads. The disorganised spectacle that they presented was particularly noticeable over foreign affairs.

This situation was exacerbated by the outbreak of the Boer War. The radicals viewed the war as unnecessary and as a piece of imperialist greed. Rosebery and his followers argued that, once begun, the war must be prosecuted successfully. In the Lords and elsewhere, Rosebery said that there would be time enough to consider the background to the hostilities when victory was won. In the meantime, while it was not necessary to treat the government entirely uncritically, it was every citizen's patriotic duty to back the war. Campbell-Bannerman occupied a middle position, inclining to the radicals.

The war, and the increased hostilities inside the party as well, revived Rosebery's interest in politics. He believed that the party might split. As he wrote to Sir Edward Grey, one of his keenest supporters at the time, "The Rump will break with the Imperialist section and ally itself with the Irishry" (99). "The Rump" became a favourite description of the radicals for him. In fact, he and his supporters were more likely to become the rump than the left of the party. Certainly the radicals were temporarily unpopular as the country was gripped with war patriotism. But Rosebery seems to have believed that both the people and much of the party were a lot readier to desert traditional Liberalism than was the case. The Liberal Imperialists, as his group was becoming known, were in danger of going the same way as the Liberal Unionists; and it was a long way from Liberalism.

Evidence of how far Rosebery was moving away from traditional Liberalism comes from an exchange of letters with Munro Ferguson in 1899. Rosebery was personally friendly with Dr. Jameson, of the Jameson raid. He wrote to Ferguson that Jameson was interested in entering parliament, either as a Tory or a Roseberyite, and he would like to see him in parliament. Even such a devoted acolyte as Ferguson was horrified at the idea: "the Tories should have him" he replied immediately (100). It was symptomatic of Rosebery's move to the right.

His friends and supporters were also anxious and irritated that Rosebery was reluctant to push himself forward in the public eye. He always maintained that he must wait for a clear call to return to active leadership, and seemed content to let them do the spreading of the message and all the campaigning. They were particularly anxious that Rosebery should make at least one major policy speech, something fresh and dramatic for them to point to and work from. Perks, for example, wrote to Rosebery in 1900:

> When is that resonant trumpet-blast coming from the North? I am quite content tho some of our friends are not. When it does come it will wake the glen I know (101).

A great set speech was to come eventually, though not until 1901. Rosebery certainly took no major part in the 1900 general election. With the news from the war improving at last, the government called the so-called Khaki Election. They were returned with a big majority, similar to that of 1895. The Liberals were unprepared and still divided, and

in no state to combat the Tory electioneering with its bombast and jingoism. The government accused them of disloyalty and announced that "a vote for the Liberals is a vote for the Boers".

This was tough campaigning anyway, but particularly infuriating to the Roseberyites who had not opposed the war. Rosebery himself protested in the Lords after the election at the government's methods, and wrote to a friend: "I never remember dirtier work done than at this election" (102). He, however, was safe from the more mundane aspects of elections, while his friends and supporters were not. All of the major Roseberyites survived, though most with reduced majorities. Munro Ferguson's fell by 500, a fact he immediately blamed on the Irish voters (103). In Scotland overall, the Liberals failed to gain a majority of the seats for the only time between the mid nineteenth century and 1914. Haldane's majority also fell, though less dramatically than Ferguson's. His election address had noted that the situation in Ireland was still "unsatisfactory", though the problem remained "obscure". Something more must be done, and he suggested

> building upwards on those foundations which the present government have, as I think, wisely laid down in the shape of a liberal extension to Ireland of that system of democratic Local Government which has succeeded so well in England and Scotland (104).

This was a reference to the 1898 Irish Local Government Act. Put through by Gerald Balfour, Arthur's brother, the Act was part of the Unionist plan to "kill Home Rule by

kindness". It established county councils and urban and rural district councils on the British model. They were to be elected by a wide franchise and to have fairly large powers, including the levying of local rates. As we shall see, Rosebery had noted this act, though he was to draw different conclusions from its operation than Haldane.

During 1901, the Liberal Imperial Council and League were formed. This body was intended to be a pressure group inside the party for Roseberyian ideas. Rosebery himself did not join, remaining content, as before, to let his lieutenants run it and wait and see. The Imperialists had felt for some time that they needed an organisation to spread their gospel and to rebutt the accusation that they were becoming indistinguishable from the Unionists: "Chamberlain wine with a Rosebery label" as John Morley put it (105).

A biography of Rosebery published in 1901 concluded, in a rather distressing metaphor

> Lord Rosebery, then, must still be regarded as a great personal and political force; he is no extinct volcano. For the time being he may appear inactive, but his energy, undiminished we may be certain, still remains, and when the psychological moment comes it will show itself once more in an eruption - not devastating, but inevitable, imperative, essential. He is part and parcel of our national life, and cannot sever himself therefore till his work is done (106).

The volcano sizzled into life in the autumn. Rosebery had spoken at the City Liberal Club of the need for a "clean slate" for Liberalism, though he had added "I must plough my furrow alone". These 2 striking phrases entered contemporary political parlance. The rival factions in the party

held a series of meetings and banquets, wittily described in the press as "war to the knife and fork".

Great excitement, therefore, was generated by Rosebery's agreement to make a major speech at Chesterfield on December 15. As one observer put it:

> All the resources of advertisement were exhausted on this engagement. The expectancy that reigned reminded old politicians of the Midlothian days. Quiet people in far-away corners of the earth were perplexed by Reuter telegrams giving daily bulletins of what was supposed to be in Lord Rosebery's mind (107).

Rosebery spoke at Chesterfield for 2 hours. He devoted over half the speech to the war. On the domestic front, he called for the launch of a campaign for "efficiency"; though why such a call should be so dramatic was left unclear. He did not specifically repudiate Home Rule; he did not need to since he attacked the Irish Nationalist Party with such fervour. As E. T. Raymond put it, he "began by ostentatiously congratulating the Liberal Party on its freedom from the Irish Alliance" (108).

> You are free altogether from the Irish Alliance and its consequences. The Irish party have repeatedly repudiated any alliance with you in terms almost insulting, and as they have now ranged themselves openly with the enemies that we are fighting in the field, I do not suppose that there is much embarrassment likely to arise from any too intimate alliance between the Irish and the Liberal party.

He called again for a complete review of policy.

> It does seem to me that ... the primary duty of the Liberal party is to wipe its slate clean and consider very carefully what it is going to write on it in future.... There are men who still sit with the fly-blown phylacteries of obsolete policies bound round their foreheads, who do not remember that, while they have been mumbling their incantations to themselves, the world has been marching and revolving (109).

The speech caused a stir inside the party that justified all the anticipatory excitement. Rosebery's supporters were pleased, the radicals annoyed. So, understandably, was Campbell-Bannerman. Rosebery might protest that he was now an independent member, but he was clearly bidding for a return to the leadership on his own terms, and Asquith, Campbell-Bannerman's deputy, had been on the Chesterfield platform. Campbell-Bannerman wrote to Gladstone's son Herbert, showing his irritation but not entirely losing his customary humour:

> All that he said about the clean slate and efficiency was an affront to Liberalism and was pure claptrap. Efficiency as a watchword! Who is against it?... What is a 'fly-blown phylactery'? Fly-blow is the result of a fly laying the egg from which maggots come in meat; no fly out of Bedlam would choose a phylactery (if he found one) for such a purpose (110).

Through the efforts of those who sought unity from both sides, a meeting was arranged between Rosebery and Campbell-Bannerman, and they had lunch together. They both left accounts of the meeting which, not surprisingly, differ somewhat. Both men, however, agreed on one central and crucial point: it was not so much the war as Ireland that divided them irreconcilably. Rosebery wrote in a memorandum on the encounter:

> He began talking about substantial agreement etc. and I somehow fell at once into Irish Home Rule and stated definitely that I could have nothing further to do with Mr. Gladstone's policy, that much had happened since 1892 including the Irish Local Government Bill and my own experience at the F.O.... This rather disconcerted C-B, as he had just declared himself at Dunfermline in favour of Irish Home Rule. He tried to soften down my declaration, but I was emphatic (111).

Campbell-Bannerman's account is more laconic; in a letter to James Bryce he wrote:

> Ireland is of itself enough to keep him away; is opposed to H. R. in any form; might agree to Provincial Councils or Lower Committee of House of Commons - a legislative body never. If he spoke again, would devote his speech to this. Used all the old Unionist arguments (112).

Relations between them were further strained when Rosebery discovered that Campbell-Bannerman had been writing to Bryce and Herbert Gladstone about the meeting. He wrote stiffly: "I confess it never occurred to me that our private, confidential (and interrupted) chat, as between old friends and colleagues, was in any sense formal or intended for communication to others" (113). Campbell-Bannerman protested that he had not made in any real sense Rosebery's comments public; but, as a party leader, he had the duty to consult with his senior colleagues. This incident ended the personal friendship between them, limited as it had been. Henceforth they were to address each other only from the public platform or through others.

During their meeting, Rosebery had been surprised by Campbell-Bannerman's vehement denunciation of his chief supporters in Scotland. As Rosebery recorded in his memorandum on the meeting:

> He spoke ... with great bitterness (quite unlike him) of the 'rebellion' attempted in Scotland which had been 'put down and squashed out by our fellows'. He named Haldane and Munro Ferguson with peculiar asperity (114).

Haldane and Ferguson tried to establish an organisation to be called the Scottish National Liberals. Haldane travelled

to Glasgow in January 1902 to launch the new body which was to promote the ideals of the Chesterfield speech and, as Haldane wrote to Rosebery, to try to "explicitly exclude the Home Rule policy of 86 and 93 as having been made impossible by the action of the Irish" (115). The idea, presumably, was to supplant the Scottish Liberal Association. For, despite all the efforts of the Roseberyites between 1899 and 1905, the S.L.A. remained in the hands of the radical wing and consistently passed anti-Imperial declarations. In February 1902 Thomas Gibson Carmichael wrote to Rosebery about the S.L.A.:

> I'm not sure but think there's a chance of capturing the organisation or at any rate of making it split in such a way that there'll be nothing worth having left to the extremists (116).

But the Imperialists were disappointed.

The Scottish National Liberals never really got going as a new and larger Roseberian organisation, the Liberal League, was founded in February 1902. In due course the Liberal Imperial League was subsumed into it. Rosebery became the President of the new League; Asquith, Grey and Fowler Vice-Presidents, later joined by Haldane. Perks and a secretary, William Allard, did the work. Among those who joined the Council was William Robertson Nicoll. Nicoll, a Scot, was educated at Aberdeen University and ordained into the Free Church. He resigned the ministry in 1885 and moved to London to concentrate on journalistic work. He founded and edited The British Weekly from 1886 until his death in 1923. The paper became the leading Nonconformist journal of its

day, and during the 1890s and 1900s was very influential. Robertson Nicoll was a man of formidable energy and determination. He was reputed to have read more books than any living journalist and founded a literary magazine, The Bookman, in 1891 to run alongside the British Weekly. He was not an altogether likeable man and his enormous reading had not perhaps succeeded in greatly broadening his mind, but he was a formidable Nonconformist champion.

A convinced Liberal, he had been against Gladstone's Home Rule policy from the beginning. He did not, however, leave the party, nor did he completely close the pages of the British Weekly to Gladstonians. Since he regarded Gladstone as a dangerous and unprincipled Anglo-Catholic, it was not surprising that he had a poor opinion of giving the Roman Catholic Irish their own parliament. He welcomed Rosebery's accession to the premiership, and Rosebery's doubts about Ireland, and the 2 began to correspond. Nicoll was a keen Imperialist, so he was a natural and influential choice for the Liberal League. He did not in fact do all that much work for the League, since his efforts were soon devoted to leading the Nonconformist attack on the 1902 Education Act.

Rosebery made 3 major speeches under the auspices of the League during 1902. On February 14 he spoke in Liverpool. He told his audience that Gladstone's ideas on Home Rule were now "by universal acknowledgement dead and buried", and stated categorically for the first time:

> I am not prepared at any time, or under any circumstances, to grant an independent Parliament in Dublin.

> What have these gentlemen (i.e. the Irish leaders) done that we should grant them this supreme and spontaneous mark of confidence?

He declared that if there had ever been a Liberal-Irish alliance, it was now dissolved, and dwelt at length on the pro-Boer stance of Ireland's leaders (117).

Haldane responded enthusiastically to this speech, writing to Rosebery:

> It was with the keenest pleasure that I read the speech of Friday night. No-one who feels strongly that much remains to be tried in Irish policy can fail to feel that the present path is hopeless and can lead nowhere but to the injury of Ireland and Liberalism alike. It needed strength and courage to say what you said. But strength and courage in lead were what was needed and hundreds of thousands will respond (118).

A month later Rosebery spoke in Glasgow. He followed much the same line, though he referred more to the question of county government.

Rosebery had written in February: "and since they (i.e. the Conservative government) passed their Local Government Bill I have not been what is called a Home Ruler" (119). At Liverpool he had said that the extension of county government had changed the Irish question beyond recognition. In Glasgow he enlarged on this in suggesting that the system of county government could be extended not only for Ireland, but for all of the British Isles. Scotland too would benefit from local government being enlarged towards some measure of devolution; any such move must be for all Britain simultaneously, Ireland could not be considered a special case.

When he wrote a preface to these speeches for publication, he again referred at length to the 1898 Irish Local Government Act. He said that this act had produced the answer to the Irish question "that I had always desired", and argued that had full county government existed in Ireland, the Liberals would never have suggested an Irish parliament in 1886 or 1893 (120). This was now his answer to those who claimed that he had changed his position on Ireland, and deserted his old chief and his ideals. He delighted in referring back to his speech at Paisley in 1885, when he had said

> Try and treat Ireland exactly as you would treat Scotland or Wales. If you pass a measure of local government for Great Britain, pass as near as may be exactly the same measure of local government for Ireland (121).

Rosebery's point here does not bear scrutiny. It was nonsense to suggest that anyone had been considering county councils as the answer to Parnell and the Home Rule agitation. He himself had never suggested them. Scotland already had them; the devolution of the 1880s, whether referring to Scotland or Ireland, always implied more than county government. Undoubtedly Rosebery was aware of this. But it did give him the chance to escape from Home Rule and give him a debating point, albeit a weak one. And in a sense it brought him back to the situation in the early 1880s when he was calling for concessions to Scotland, and calling for such concessions not to be swamped in the desire to placate Ireland. He suddenly resurrected his interest in Scotland in asking for the extension of county government

throughout the British Isles. He was trying to use Scotland to drive back the Irish demand. Charles Douglas, now a Roseberian M.P., followed this line in an article in the Contemporary Review in April, calling for a "fighting policy" of "constructive devolution" (122).

Rosebery's third speech of 1902 was delivered in Edinburgh on November 1. Edinburgh had been something of an embarrassment to the Liberal League. The League was doing well in Glasgow, always a receptive place for Imperial ideas. But enthusiasm in Edinburgh was notably lacking and the local parties remained firmly radical. The Young Scots Society was strong and Rosebery had a strong enemy in Hector Macpherson editor of the Edinburgh Evening News. Macpherson was to publish an attack on Rosebery in The Speaker, as well as opposing him through his own paper. His Speaker article, "Scottish Liberalism Past and Present", bitterly criticised Rosebery's decision to support the Boer War and accused him of weakening the party and trying to split it. Macpherson claimed Rosebery had never been a Gladstonian; despite Midlothian it had all been pretence. He had led the Liberal Leaguers into the wilderness over imperialism. They now realised this and wished to return to the main body of the movement, despite Rosebery "the two sections of Liberals are drawing visibly together" (123).

This article may not have been very constructive, or particularly accurate, but it showed what Rosebery was up against in Edinburgh. Nonetheless it was felt essential

that the League should have a branch on Rosebery's home ground, and a small one was formed in July 1902. After much manoeuvering by Gibson Carmichael this branch issued an invitation to Rosebery to address them, which he did in November. The speech followed the same lines of argument as the ones in Liverpool and Glasgow (124).

What Macpherson had predicted, and hoped for, was slowly to happen. The leading Roseberyites began to divide from Rosebery. This did not happen over imperialism on which they were all agreed. It developed over Ireland which, as we have seen, was the contentious issue. In March 1902, between Rosebery's speeches in Liverpool and Glasgow, Asquith spoke in favour of a "step-by-step" policy. This was the idea that Home Rule for Ireland would remain as the eventual goal for Liberalism, but would be approached not by the next Liberal government immediately introducing a Home Rule Bill, but "step-by-step".

The same month Rosebery dissented strongly from this idea in an article in the Pall Mall Gazette. The disagreement over this can also be traced in draft statements of the aims of the Liberal League in Rosebery's papers. Asquith had written: "With regard to Ireland the League is opposed to such counsel of despair as the grant of an independent Irish Parliament". To this is added in Rosebery's hand: "or of anything that would lead up to it". Since they could not agree, the whole sentence was deleted in the next draft (125).

Haldane finally declared strongly for "step-by-step" in 1904. In a speech in Cambridge he said:

> The people of this country will tolerate nothing that interferes with the supremacy of parliament. The question is whether we can, within these limits, deal effectively with the Irish question; and I am one of those who think you can. Then something becomes obvious, - you will have to proceed by degrees, step by step, in your dealing with the great problems that surround you. The Irish would not be content with dealing with things by degrees if they felt the successive instalments were merely a request to them to be content with what you were giving them. Their aspiration, after all, is self-government (126).

This became the official policy of all the party in 1905 when Campbell-Bannerman declared in its favour. He had perhaps up until then cherished the hope of introducing a Home Rule Bill. But he came to see that it was not just the imperialist wing who felt that the party should not face the electorate again with Home Rule as a principal plank in their platform. Many radicals were saying that the people of England and Scotland had the right to be offered major legislation if they were to be expected to vote Liberal.

In the autumn of 1905 Rosebery embarked on another speaking tour for the Liberal League. At Stourbridge he said that the official leader of the party must either promise to bring forward Home Rule or to drop it.

> Any middle policy - that of placing Home Rule in the position of a reliquary, and only exhibiting it at great moments of public stress, as Roman Catholics are accustomed to exhibit relics of a saint - is not one which will earn sympathy or success in this country (127).

On November 25 in reply Campbell-Bannerman advocated the stop by step policy in a speech at Stirling. What Rosebery did not know, because he had not told him, was that Campbell-Bannerman did so after consultation with Asquith. Nor was Rosebery told by any of its participants of the so-called "Relugas Compact". This was an agreement worked out by Asquith, Grey and Haldane, by which they decided that they would not serve under Campbell-Bannerman if he remained in the Commons. They would accept a Campbell-Bannerman premiership if he would take himself to the Lords, and leave the leadership of the Commons, and thus presumably the substance of power, to Asquith.

What this meant of course was that the leading Imperialists had finally abandoned the idea of Rosebery returning to lead the party. They preserved their image of the party they wished to see, but they transferred their allegiance as leader to Asquith. It was to be Roseberyism without Rosebery. They had finally tired of Rosebery's periods of withdrawal and silence, of his over sensitivity, of his endless definings of his position, of his well-cultivated image as the elder statesman above party day to day problems. He had been too long out of touch and out on a limb. And, as sensitive and acute politicians, they could sense that Campbell-Bannerman was clearly on the way up and Rosebery on the way down. The Unionist government was crawling along to its defeat divided over Tariff Reform. Campbell-Bannerman after all the bitter years in the wilderness now had the air of a winner about him.

Rosebery knew none of this when he made the major speech of his current tour of Cornwall at Bodmin on November 26. He devoted much of it to the free trade controversy and the Empire. Only at the end did he turn to the subject his audience was waiting for: Ireland. He repudiated what Campbell-Bannerman had said at Stirling when he had "hoisted once more, in its most pronounced form, the flag of Irish Home Rule", and declared unequivocally

> I, then, will add no more on this subject, except to say emphatically and explicitly and once for all that I cannot serve under that banner (128).

This declaration can have surprised no-one.

In any event it hardly mattered. Rosebery had described Bodmin privately as "probably my last platform speech" (129). In the sense of influencing Liberal policy it was. A week later the Government resigned and Campbell-Bannerman took office. The Relugas conspiracy collapsed. Campbell-Bannerman, a wily man when he needed to be, sent for Asquith alone and offered him his choice of the chief ministries, remarking mildly that he had heard it said that he should go to the Lords but that he could not consider it. Asquith, as Campbell-Bannerman well knew, was the most disenchanted of the Roseberyites, the nearest to the centre of the party, and the most ambitious. Completely out-manoeuvred, Asquith accepted the Chancellorship of the Exchequer and abandoned his friends. Haldane and Grey, now in no position to dictate their terms on their own, had no choice but to come in. Grey got the foreign office and Haldane the war office. Haldane had wanted to become Lord Chancellor, but Campbell-

Bannerman regarded him with more disfavour than any of the other ex-Roseberians and refused. He was lucky to get into the Cabinet. Munro Ferguson, the closest of the group to Rosebery and the least popular in the party, did not get even an Under-Secretaryship.

Campbell-Bannerman's immense victory in the general election at the beginning of 1906 signalled the end of Rosebery's political career. He was now, and remained, an irrelevance. Campbell-Bannerman was welcomed as a hero throughout the party and there were few thoughts spared for the sage of Dalmeny. He was generous in defeat. He never publicly reproached his erstwhile lieutenants for reaching an understanding on Ireland with Campbell-Bannerman without telling him. In the summer of 1906 in his villa in Naples he wrote another of his memoranda on his future.

> It seems to me plain that my best course would be total and final retirement. But I have not found total and final retirement easy in the past. It would however be much easier in the future, unless I am much mistaken; for I cannot see who would wish to draw me from it. Formerly, there were only too many. But hereafter there will I think be none. What alternative indeed is there?... The only argument that I can see against retirement is the future of Liberal Imperialism. The next government will be radical, perhaps extremely radical; it will at any rate not be Liberal Imperialist. It will contain a notable nucleus indeed of that description, but this will tend to drift away; and will be impelled by the forces behind it in a very different direction. I may note that I have done my best for the cause, but have been baffled by the party machine. I acknowledge that I did not realise the strength of the machine, ... Is it then worth while to spend the few remaining years of one's life in embarrassing one's friends in office by maintaining an independent political position, and raising the voice of one crying in the wilderness? The question answers itself.... There is no doubt the Liberal League. Will the League continue to exist? On that I cannot pronounce with certainty, but I should say not. Politicians do not care to preach and parade in a

> wilderness. The fruitful oasis of bounty and patronage will be elsewhere. Seeing then no other considerations of public welfare I think I see clear and near the time at which I shall bid a final farewell to the political scene (130).

His memorandum may have been self-pitying but it was accurate enough. The Liberal League staggered on for a few years and was dissolved in 1910; Rosebery had already left it. Rosebery attacked Lloyd George's people's budget as "socialistic", and the old champion of Lords reform described the Parliament Act as "ill-judged, revolutionary, and partisan", though he did eventually vote for it under protest (131). No-one cared or took much notice; his time was past.

Haldane remained in the government until 1915 when he was driven from office by a smear campaign describing him as pro-German. His old friend Asquith abandoned him again as the price of keeping power. There had been some suggestion of making Haldane Irish Secretary when the Liberals had been preparing for power in 1905. But he was still far too closely associated with Rosebery to be at all acceptable to the Irish party, as John Redmond's notes of a meeting with John Morley show.

> He asked me what I thought of Sir R. Reid for Irish Secretary? I said I would prefer him in the Woolsack, where he ought to be sent. He mentioned Haldane, but as I commenced to swear he did not pursue the matter (132).

In the end, as we have seen, he went to the War Office. There he embarked on major proposals for army reform, a subject he found interesting and congenial. When Asquith

became Prime Minister in 1908 on Campbell-Bannerman's death, he kept Haldane at the War Office. Haldane was persuaded to go to the Lords in 1911 as leader of that House when Lord Crewe, Rosebery's son-in-law and eventual biographer, fell ill. He continued to hold the war ministry as well until the next year when, on the retirement of Lord Loreburn, the former Scottish member R. T. Reid, he became Lord Chancellor. The law had always been one of Haldane's great enthusiasms and he had long hoped to be Lord Chancellor.

It was, however, a difficult time for a Liberal peer. After the general elections of 1910 the party was again dependent on the Irish for a majority. The "step-by-step" policy had produced no results and the government were again committed to a full Home Rule Bill. Under the working of the Parliament Act it was presumed that it was only a matter of time before Home Rule came into operation. The Unionists however, under a new leader Andrew Bonar Law, had other ideas. With their Protestant allies in Ulster they were promising the government a great deal more than just parliamentary opposition. Haldane seems to have been very little involved in the actual mechanics of the third Home Rule Bill, but he did get enmeshed in one dispute that arose out of the threats of violence in Ulster.

This was the incident known as the Curragh Mutiny. The Cabinet decided to move some extra troops into Ulster to make a show of strength in case the Ulster Volunteers were contemplating any sort of take-over of the province. Without Asquith's knowledge and through the foolishness of

the new secretary of war, Jack Seely, and the general commanding in Ireland, Paget, officers were then presented with an ultimatum that they must either leave the army or be prepared to undertake "active operations in Ulster". Faced with this, Brigadier Hubert Gough and a number of officers at the Curragh Barracks said they would opt for resignation. Through a rabid Unionist in the War Office, Henry Wilson, the affair was leaked to Bonar Law and the Unionist leadership, and a major row developed in parliament.

The government, most of which was in ignorance of most or all of what had happened, was caught off guard and in some disarray. Haldane became involved because he had many contacts in the army after his 7 years as war minister. As he wrote to his mother: "Generals are coming to see me as an old friend" and Haig sought out Haldane on a visit to London to inform him of the strength of feeling in favour of Gough among serving officers (133). The muddle was made worse by statements to the 2 Houses by Asquith and Haldane. As Haldane recalled:

> I made a speech in the House in which I pointed out that it would be the duty of any government to protect life and property if there were unfortunately a rising in Ulster, and that we were bound to use troops for the purpose if the police force were not sufficient.... In the sentence which followed I added that we had no intention of giving orders to the troops to intervene, meaning, of course, so long as riots and attacks on barracks, which had been threatened but had not taken place so far, did not occur (134).

Asquith made a speech to the Commons on the same lines, though it emerged that orders to move to Ulster had been given. The Unionists also took Haldane's statement as a

pledge that in no circumstances would troops be used in Ulster. This Haldane had palpably not meant to say. Making matters worse, he therefore decided to alter the wording of his speech slightly before it was published in Hansard: he inserted "immediate" before "intention".

This was a foolish thing to do under the circumstances. The Unionists were enjoying the whole affair, and the spectacle of the government in such confusion, enormously. They immediately pounced on Haldane and accused him of materially altering the sense of his speech and attempting to falsify the record. They demanded, and got, a debate on his conduct. Haldane wrote to his mother of this debate: "I ... gave them back as good as they gave me - there was a fine row which did no harm" (135).

Brave words, but no-one could disguise the mess and muddle the government had made of the incident. It was particularly galling for Haldane. He had enjoyed his years at the War Office and was proud of his good relations with the military. He had been misinformed, or at least inadequately informed, by Seely who had handled the "mutiny" with neither sense nor tact.

The outbreak of the First World War of course turned attention away from Ireland and the whole controversy over Home Hule. Haldane remained in office for another year. In the period after the war he made various small efforts to mediate in the war that developed in Ireland, but no-one took much notice of his pleas for peace and moderation.

Events in Ireland had far passed the conditions that he understood. Curiously, he was to take office once more as Lord Chancellor, for the first Labour government in its brief 8 months of office. They were pleased to have him, but he was more of a spectator than a decision maker.

It is not always easy to remember the respect, even veneration, in which Rosebery was held in his time. As we have seen, his is essentially a story of failure. But it is vital, in studying his career, to accept the remarkably influential position he occupied. He was seen as one of the foremost men in public life from Midlothian in 1879 to the general election of 1906. As the man of the future, as party leader, and as elder statesman and sage, he was always considered important and worth listening to and attending to. No-one, from any party, ever approached the position Rosebery occupied throughout Scotland as a whole: it was unique.

This position in Scotland was created initially by the first Midlothian campaign, and was based on the relationship he quickly established with Gladstone. Gladstone's obvious regard for his young disciple, and his freely expressed belief that one day Rosebery would lead the party, were an invaluable boost to his career. The enthusiasm of the party leader was no doubt of most significance in the upper echelons of Liberalism where Rosebery's career would be made.

It was also of significance in Scotland, where Gladstone's opinion carried great weight. The allegiance of Scottish

Liberalism Rosebery then proceeded to cultivate by his attention to Scottish affairs over the next 3 years. Though his ambitions inevitably extended beyond Scotland, his enthusiasm for his country and its people and history was genuine enough. His desire too, for some modest degree of devolution was real, and in the expression of Scottish grievances and demands he felt he had found a useful means of helping his country, furthering his career, and consolidating his position as Scotland's spokesman.

His time as the unofficial minister for Scotland was not a success. Encouraged by Midlothian, he believed that he had a special relationship with Gladstone which would have justified special attention to his demands. He did not receive such attention, and was clearly distressed to discover that Gladstone did not see concessions to Scotland through Rosebery as a priority. After the failure of his first governmental experience Rosebery realigned his approach to politics, and Scotland ceased to be the main focus of his career and thinking from 1883. His one concrete achievement for Scotland was the eventual creation of the post of Scottish Secretary in 1885. To this extent he had justified the position he had made for himself in Scotland. But the result came too late for him to be still interested in holding the appointment himself. By this time he saw his career as moving into another, and more widely based phase. He was fortunate in keeping the affection of the Scottish Liberals, who believed that he had indeed worked hard for his country and continued to look to him as their leader at least until 1895.

The proposal to give Home Rule to Ireland emerged just as Rosebery was moving his career into its new phase. Rosebery was never enthusiastic about the idea of Irish Home Rule, indeed the evidence suggests that he was never enthusiastic about, or sympathetic to, Ireland at all. His natural inclinations probably lay more with the Liberal Unionists. But, because his career was identified so closely with only 2 things, devolution and loyalty to Gladstone, he was carried along into support. As he had shown after the Phoenix Park murders, he enjoyed the grand gesture of support for his chief. And, unlike Hartington or Chamberlain, his career had no independent existence or visible substance outside the twin themes of support for Gladstone and devolution, both of which seemed to point unwaveringly towards backing Home Rule. Though his interest in Scotland might have diminished, he became the victim of his own skilful exploitation of Scottish politics.

After 1886 ideas about devolution were of necessity considered primarily in terms of Home Rule. Rosebery continued to pay lip-service to the notion of general devolution, and to toy with the further idea of Imperial Federation, but precisely because it would be impossible to promote the type of devolution he favoured without pulling back to some extent from the commitment to Ireland, his ideas remained vague and unformed.

By 1892 he had definitely decided that the commitment to Ireland over Home Rule should be abandoned. He considered

that the Irish leaders were too fundamentally disloyal to the concepts of Britain and Empire to be entrusted with control of their own parliament. The Irish did not deserve, and had not tried to earn, the enormous effort that was needed by the Liberal party to continue to pursue such a divisive and dramatic policy.

Having reached this decision, Rosebery was slow and indecisive in publicising it. This was not, until after 1896, entirely his own fault. He had his loyalty to Gladstone to consider and, after Gladstone's retirement, was never in a commanding position in the party and so was forced to tread warily. After his own resignation of the leadership, he had his chance and his reluctance, or inability to take it, proved fatal. The Liberals had no clear overall leader, and the soul of Liberalism was waiting to be guided. He believed that his image of Liberalism was viable, was consistent with the best of the party's traditions, and reflected majority opinion among the electorate.

Perhaps because he had had it easy at the outset of his career, and had moved quickly to the top, he could not find it in himself to make the commitment to fight determinedly and consistently for what he believed in and wanted. Having always surrounded himself with acolytes, he did not see that to change the party's direction, he needed to be more than a figure-head and a symbol. It was not enough to leave his supporters to press the case and wait to be called on to resume the leadership of a purified and revivified party.

When Rosebery said that he had retired he meant that he had retired until the call came to return and lead. But eventually even his own friends and supporters began to take him at his word that he had retired from public life. He waited in the wings, but the cue to come on never came.

CHAPTER 6: UNIONISM: A. J. BALFOUR

> Come, join every heart, let the air loudly ring!
> Of a people united and mighty we sing;
> To the ends of the earth while the tidings are heard,
> Be their fame, like Fate's fiat, applauded and fear'd;
> Now that joy ev'ry bosom receives and imparts,
> Come join this blest Union of hands and of hearts:
> St. George, and St. Andrew, St. Patrick shall join
> The league fix'd as Fate, and the compact divine;
> While the world's admiration and fear are excited,
> To see Ireland, and Scotland, and England united.
>
> Opening poem, The Union Song-Book (1801)

Liberalism owed much to Scotland in the late nineteenth century. This chapter will be concerned with the other main political grouping: Unionism. It tended to be the minority party in Scotland; only at one general election, 1900, did it win more than half of the Scottish seats. As with the Liberals, Ireland was a main preoccupation for the Unionists, as the name would indicate. Principally, of course, it is Conservatism that will be discussed. But from 1886 Conservatism was bolstered and encouraged by Liberal Unionism. The words Unionism and Unionist were used to avoid the repetition of referring to the Conservative and Liberal Unionist parties, but it was not only a matter of convenience. It was above all devotion to the Union, or Unions, that marked the parties, and the result of that devotion: opposition to above all Irish, though also Scottish, Home Rule. Indeed in the early stages of their alliance it was only this that welded together the 2 parties. Increasingly they merged, though the Liberal Unionists hung onto their independence, however nominal, until 1912.

Scottish Unionism produced 2 major leaders during the period of this study: Arthur James Balfour and Andrew Bonar Law. Ireland was critical to both their careers. Other notable Scottish Conservatives included Balfour's younger brother Gerald, Irish Secretary (1895-1900) and President of the Board of Trade (1900-1905); and the young John Buchan, Conservative journalist and prospective parliamentary candidate in the years leading up to the First World War.

The most prominent Liberal Unionist from Scotland was R. B. Finlay. Finlay was born at Newhaven near Edinburgh in 1842. He went to Edinburgh University to study medicine, becoming a keen Liberal and playing a prominent part in Gladstone's election as Lord Rector in 1860. Having graduated as a doctor, he abandoned medicine in favour of English law and was called to the Bar in 1867. He was a successful barrister and became a Q.C. in 1882. Having been unsuccessful Liberal candidate for a by-election in Haddingtonshire in 1883, he was elected for Inverness in 1885. He broke with Gladstone, mainly because he felt strongly about Ulster, and held his seat as a Liberal Unionist in 1886. Over the next 5 years he established himself as a skilful and logical debater in the Commons, though he was never an impassioned orator and loathed making platform speeches. He was noted for his strong support of Balfour's rule in Ireland. He lost his seat in 1892 but, after 3 years of lucrative private practice, regained it in 1895, and was appointed Solicitor General. In 1900 he was promoted to Attorney General, which post he held until the

resignation of the Unionist government in 1905. Defeated in the Liberal landslide of 1906, he returned to parliament at the first election of 1910 for Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities. Finlay was to reach the top of his profession in 1916 when he was appointed Lord Chancellor by Lloyd George (1).

Though Scottish Liberal Unionism produced few other important figures, A. R. D. Elliott, biographer of his friend Goschen was one, it did turn up several political curiosities. One was Charles Fraser-Mackintosh, M.P. for Inverness-shire. He had been one of the small but influential group of Crofter M.P.s, a group associated with Celtic interests and the radical wing of the Liberal party whose unofficial leader was G. B. Clark. Like his close friend John Stuart Blackie, Fraser-Mackintosh obviously felt no sense of Celtic solidarity with Ireland or enthusiasm for Home Rule. He defected to the Liberal Unionists in 1886, and such, presumably, was his hold on the constituency that he was returned unopposed. He lost the seat, however, in 1892 and retired from politics.

Another defector was Sir George Trevelyan, who had served as both Irish and Scottish Secretary. He was defeated by 30 votes and, though he was returned to parliament in a by-election a year later, it was as a Gladstonian. He went on to serve again as Scottish Secretary. Since all his ministerial career, indeed all his parliamentary career, was as a Gladstonian, it is hardly fair to count him as a Liberal

Unionist at all! The only other famous name in Scottish Liberal Unionism was that of the novelist Arthur Conan Doyle, twice an unsuccessful candidate: in Edinburgh Central in 1900 and Hawick in 1906.

Scottish Unionism was a major movement in Scottish life. Its main base tended to be in the west, centred on Glasgow. Glasgow, with its wide manufacturing and trading interests, was closely linked to the empire and the imperial ideal which made it receptive to Unionism. Glasgow and the west of Scotland also had traditional links with Protestant north east Ulster. Support for Ulster resistance to Home Rule was encouraged in Glasgow and its satellite towns by the presence of large Orange communities. These towns suffered outbreaks of sectarian violence that were only found on a similar scale in Liverpool, and in Belfast itself.

It was not, however, merely the presence of a vociferous immigrant Protestant community supporting Ulster. As an immigrant group they were heavily outnumbered throughout Scotland by the Roman Catholic nationalist Irish. Many Scots considered the Protestants of Ulster as the same people as themselves. The plantations of Ulster in the seventeenth century had mostly consisted of Scots, and throughout that century the feeling had persisted that the west of Scotland and the north east of Ireland, separated only by a small stretch of water, were in a sense the same country and the same community. Vestiges of that belief remained. While Unionists in England were happy, in

Randolph Churchill's famous phrase, to "play the Orange card" to bolster resistance to Home Rule, many Unionists in Scotland genuinely sympathised with Ulster's fears. For them the Ulstermen were not just a stick with which to beat the Liberals, they were threatened friends with whom it was easy to identify.

The sense of one community was particularly strong inside the Presbyterian churches. Many Ulster ministers trained in Scotland, and there was a degree of interchange between ministers in the 2 countries. An ancestor of the journalist and essayist Robert Lynd had taken up a living in Ulster when he quarrelled with his Scottish parishioners (2). James Bryce's grandfather did the same thing after falling out with his congregation in Wick. Paradoxically, since he was a Home Ruler and a leading Liberal, Bryce and his family are a good example of the interaction between Scotland and Ulster. His grandfather had 3 sons, all born and brought up in Belfast. Two of them stayed there while James' father returned to Scotland when James was 8 to teach at Glasgow High School. Holidays for the family were spent back in Ulster and James kept up close links with his uncles, links that were to cause him much difficulty and sadness when he followed Gladstone over Ireland, a decision his Ulster relatives could never understand and bitterly resented (3). The other great example of Scoto-Ulster links, of course, is the career and family of Bonar Law.

The Ulster covenant, in itself inspired by the seventeenth century Presbyterian National Covenant in Scotland, was signed by many in Scotland, including over a thousand in Edinburgh who signed on an old covenanter's tombstone in the Greyfriars Kirkyard. But it was confined to those of direct Ulster stock, immigrants, so was not really a demonstration of Scottish feeling. As a final illustration of the sense of community between Scotland and Protestant Ulster, this quotation is from a speech by R. B. Finlay on the second reading of the first Home Rule Bill.

> Ulster is largely inhabited by a population nearly akin in blood and religion to that of Scotland. That population, if this Bill passed, will be in a permanent minority. They protest with one voice against the passing of this Bill.... I heard with some surprise complacent references made last night to the probability that John Bull might employ the forces of the crown for the purpose of putting down the Ulster to which I refer. As to that, John Bull may answer for himself; but, if I know anything at all of my own fellow-countrymen, I am perfectly certain that Scotland will never abandon Ulster (4).

Liberalism's loss of The Scotsman over Home Rule, discussed in the last chapter, was perhaps the most important defection in Scotland. It gave Unionism both of the country's national newspapers. For the other leading paper, the Glasgow Herald, was already Unionist, Tory Unionist. It held to a consistent policy of opposition to Liberalism and to Home Rule, and could too be markedly anti-Irish at times.

Scotland's 2 most famous journals were also Conservative. Blackwood's Magazine had always been Tory, indeed had been noted in its early years for the ferocity of its Toryism. By the beginning of the twentieth century its editorial

style was more ponderous and dignified, but the Toryism unabated. The magazine was no longer as exciting or interesting as it had been, but its circulation remained considerable. The decline of the Edinburgh Review from its great days was even more marked than that of Blackwoods. It had abandoned its Whiggery in favour of a strong Tory imperialism, and its "Review of the Parliamentary Session" column promoted Britishness, ridiculed ideas for an Irish or a Scottish parliament and attacked the Irish Nationalist party with vigour (5). Of other Unionist journals, the most exciting was the Scots Observer edited by W. E. Henley and published between 1888 and 1890, which will be discussed below.

Against the background of this brief sketch of Scottish Unionism, we shall now turn to look at the attitudes to Ireland of Scotland's most influential late nineteenth century Conservative: Arthur James Balfour.

A. J. Balfour (1848-1930) was active in politics for 50 years. He attended the Congress of Berlin with Disraeli in 1878; in 1926 he wrote a report on the future relations of the countries inside the British empire. The high points of his political achievement were his work as Chief Secretary for Ireland between 1887 and 1891, and the issuing of the Balfour Declaration on a Jewish homeland in 1917. Such a career was necessarily remarkable, if only for longevity. When he resigned from the leadership of his party in 1911, to general relief, few if any would have believed that his

active career in politics was not finished. It was not: within 2 years he had re-emerged to be a main participant in the negotiations over the third Home Rule Bill crisis and then to serve as the coalition government's foreign secretary during the war. In all, he spent nearly 30 years in office as a minister.

Inevitably the student of this period of Scottish history is drawn to comparing and contrasting the styles and careers of Balfour and Lord Rosebery. Rosebery also resigned the leadership of his party in opposition, though the relief at his doing so was mostly his own. Unlike Balfour he never held office again. This caused as much surprise, certainly to himself, as Balfour's rapid return to top level politics did later. There is an obvious contrast too in their governmental experience: Rosebery built an enormous reputation on relatively little tenure of office, Balfour's reputation tended to tarnish as he remained almost continuously in office.

The similarities between the 2 men, however, are more noticeable than the differences. Both were Scots, lowlanders, patricians, authors on subjects other than politics, and came to prominence at an early age. Both of them did the university circuit in Scotland: though Balfour collected less rectorships he achieved the greater accolade of election as Chancellor of Edinburgh. And both men were treated with tremendous defference and respect by their parties in Scotland. Balfour was probably the less universally admired of the 2 in Scotland overall: he made no

effort to promote himself as a Scottish spokesman as Rosebery did so successfully. Indeed he was much less publicly a Scot and it was his English Cecil inheritance that was pushing forward his career. Inside his own party, however, he seems to have inspired even more devotion than Rosebery did in his, precisely because he was at the time their only Scottish leader of substance, and because as Irish Chief Secretary he revitalised Unionism.

There is also the point to be made that both men were ultimately political failures. The nature of Rosebery's failure has been discussed above. Balfour's failure was more subtle; it was only gradually that the lack of concrete achievement in his career became obvious to contemporaries and he acquired the reputation of holding office just for its own sake, almost out of habit. Since his death it is easier to see that he left remarkably little after a life-time of decision making.

It is perhaps amusing to note as a footnote to this comparison that the 2 men disliked each other. Ponsonby, the son of Queen Victoria's private secretary wrote:

> I was always surprised at the way he (i.e. Balfour) and Lord Rosebery disliked each other, when really they were so much alike and there seems little difference in the way they looked on the various questions of the day. They were both literary, both very cynical, and both lazy.... There was always a certain rivalry between them. Rosebery said that for an amateur politician Balfour was wonderful: while Balfour told me he always admired the glib way Rosebery spoke when he knew little or nothing of the subject on which he was speaking (6).

Balfour's character was an endless source of speculation to his contemporaries. As any study of the literature about him and the period soon makes clear, it has continued to intrigue; one of the most recent critics to study him has written: "it was, like Balfour's public career, a locked Chinese box of paradoxes which seemed to defy penetration" (7). Above all it was the air of languor allied with sang-froid and sophistry that so surprised his friends, acquaintances and enemies, and either amused or appalled them. There seems little doubt that at bottom they covered a cold heart. He professed a doubting stoical form of Christianity which, if it allowed for some faith, had little room for hope or charity. He found that the cultivation of his fairly bleak outlook on life into a philosophy for every day provided a useful and distinctive way of conducting his social and his political life.

The languor that became his hallmark was partly rooted in his nature, but was mostly affectation. It disguised a strong ambition. Within the limits of his bleak view of life, it also disguised strong opinions; often strong positive opinions, not just the negative pessimism of reactionary Conservatism. The air of detached cynicism and of casualness was a particularly English affectation; a mixture of late Victorian extravagant aestheticism and the tradition of masking strong convictions under an aura of indifference. For, of all the leading Scots of the late nineteenth century, Balfour was the least Scottish in tone and in outlook.

The Balfours were a wealthy lowland landowning family with estates in East Lothian and Ross-shire based on money made in India. Arthur's mother was a Cecil, the sister of the third Marquis of Salisbury, leading Tory and successor to Disraeli. The Cecils were one of the most powerful English political families, products, like the Cavendishes, of the Tudor age. A tradition of service had become a right to rule over the intervening centuries. Arthur's political make-up was to a large degree a Cecil one. Wishing to pursue a political career, he inevitably looked to his uncle Robert and learnt from him.

Balfour was also divorced from Scotland by never representing a Scottish constituency. He symbolised this and capitalised on his Cecil inheritance by first entering parliament, in 1874, for Hertford, a seat under the influence of his uncle, if not in his actual gift. He did not make a spectacular start to his parliamentary career: indeed, it was 2 years before he made his maiden speech, on a minor question of Indian finance to an empty house. Nonetheless his uncle, moved either by family feeling or observation of powers not yet developed, appointed him his private secretary in 1878 and promptly took him to the Congress of Berlin. Balfour was making his name in other ways too: the same year he published a philosophical book, The Defence of Philosophic Doubt. Thereafter the expression "Philosophic Doubt" became another catch phrase associated with him and his clever but uncommitted approach to life. It was certainly a clever book and it helped to foster his

reputation in Scotland where such evidence of seriousness was appreciated, and seen as in the tradition of the Scottish enlightenment. It did not, however, have quite the same effect in the House of Commons, where learned work in fields other than the political was viewed with suspicion, especially in the Tory party.

The general election of 1880 saw Balfour safely returned for his seat. Having secured re-election, Hertford being an early seat to poll, he was called to help the party in Midlothian. Though the Conservatives were losing badly they still had some hopes of stopping Gladstone himself at Midlothian. As a local, Balfour was drafted in. He described the occasion in later life in very Balfourian vein, managing to give the impression that the result had always been a foregone conclusion.

> The centre of electoral interest at the moment was Midlothian, where Lord Dalkeith was engaged in a gallant but hopeless struggle with Mr. Gladstone, and was in urgent need of all the help he could obtain. It is true that the mere number of his fellow-workers could make little difference in the result. No shoal of minnows, however numerous, could lash the surface of the political ocean into foam in rivalry with this particular whale. But we - the minnows - had to do our best; and as I was a Scotsman, as I belonged to the Lothians, as I had recently spoken in Edinburgh, and (best of all), as I was a successful candidate when successful Conservative candidates were few, my help was warmly welcomed. I need scarcely add that it was quite ineffectual (8).

This was, incidentally, as eloquent a tribute to Gladstone's power during the campaign as any furnished by Lord Rosebery or John Morley. The speech Balfour referred to he had delivered in December 1879 and was reprinted during the election as a pamphlet. In a preface he added to it, Balfour

remarked archly that "no man ... can do otherwise than occupy himself with the interminable series of speeches with which Mr. Gladstone has lately favoured us" (9).

In the parliament of 1880-85, Balfour began to make his mark. Gladstone was premier, Salisbury leading the opposition in the Lords after the death of Disraeli in 1881. Conservative leadership in the Commons was in the hands of Sir Stafford Northcote and his 2 lieutenants Sir Richard Cross and W. H. Smith. Balfour became associated with a small group of Tories, dubbed "the Fourth Party" who felt that Northcote's style of opposition was feeble, too gentlemanly and too restrained. They resolved to harry the government on every possible occasion and revelled in the fuss they managed to cause. They also enjoyed the embarrassment that their antics occasioned their nominal leaders. Northcote they openly ridiculed while, with a nice mixture of wit and snobbery, they christened Cross and Smith "Marshall and Snelgrove".

The Fourth Party was led by the rising star of Toryism: Lord Randolph Churchill. The other members were traditionally held to be Sir Henry Drummond Wolff, John Gorst and Balfour (10). Balfour, however, was recognised at the time as the outsider of the group, and is now, in the words of Churchill's most recent biographer, "generally recognised" to have been "only ancillary to the Fourth Party alliance" (11). Balfour himself gave a typically Balfourian reason for joining them: that, as they sat on the front bench below

the gangway on the opposition side, there was room for his long legs. The Irish M.P. Frank Hugh O'Donnell coined a famous aphorism about the group:

> Drummond Wolff started the Fourth Party; Gorst made it; Churchill led it; Balfour adorned it. Balfour was a member of the Fourth Party in the body, while always communing in the spirit with the Conservative Front Bench (12).

Churchill, like the rest of the House, still did not seriously consider him sufficiently in earnest politically, and Balfour certainly continued to look to his uncle, rather than Churchill, as his leader. Salisbury was, at any rate, frequently content to give unofficial blessing to Fourth Party manoeuvres, and Balfour's association with the group helped rather than hindered his career.

Churchill and his colleagues took any opportunity to attack the government. Significantly however, it was Ireland that animated Balfour's fiercest onslaughts. He objected vigorously to the 1881 Land Act, which granted tenants the "3 Fs"; more vigorously than most Conservatives. He denounced its provisions as "socialistic" and as likely to encourage the Irish to believe that agitation would be successful in producing concessions. He took his views to Disraeli, then in the last months of his life, who told him that though he might be right, the Lords and the Irish landlords were prepared to accept the act and there was no future in objecting to it (13).

Balfour caused a considerable sensation with his next contribution to an Irish debate, in May 1882. The House was

discussing the "Kilmainham Treaty". The problem for Gladstone was that the decision to release Parnell was an entirely pragmatic one, a sensible effort to try and get out of an increasingly hopeless situation. As a pragmatic response it was open to the obvious charge that the government had abandoned principle in treating with the Irish. The Irish Secretary, W. E. Forster, took this line and resigned. When the release of Parnell came up for debate in the Commons later Forster made a powerful and typically pugnacious speech and it was felt that Gladstone's position was not a strong one.

It was at this point of the debate that Balfour spoke. In a comparatively short speech he concentrated on deriding the government's insistence that no actual bargain had been arranged.

> The Government had not entered into a contract; no, they had only given the Hon. Gentlemen behind them something they very much desired, and the Hon. Gentlemen have, on their part, given the Government something they very much desired.

Then, in a passage that became famous, he added

> He did not think that any such transaction could be quoted from the annals of our political or parliamentary history. It stood alone - he did not wish to use strong language, but he was going to say - it stood alone in its infamy.

He concluded with a further resounding denunciation: "The Executive was degraded by negotiations with these men" (14).

Gladstone was very annoyed and upset by Balfour's speech, and in particular by his use of the word "infamy". He replied at length and with heat and it was some time before

the friendly relations which had previously existed were restored between them. Balfour recorded in his Chapters of Autobiography "I was exceedingly indignant". His official biographer said that he was "really angry" and wrote of the incident: "The day came at last when he was roused, and on that day for the first time he really held the House" (15). Certainly it was the first time he had showed that he could speak with real fight, even venom.

There does seem to be a real distinction to be drawn between his general pursuing of the government on the fringes of the Fourth Party, an activity all the 4 friends enjoyed, and his genuine involvement in debate on Irish questions. He kept up the attack. When the Arrears Act which was part of the "Kilmainham Treaty" was introduced, he objected to it on the same grounds as he had opposed the 1881 Land Act. And when Gladstone proposed to use the closure to pass a Coercion Act in the wake of the murder of Lord Frederick Cavendish, Balfour disagreed publicly for the first time with Randolph Churchill. Churchill denounced the introduction of the closure, while Balfour spoke in its favour (16).

Gladstone's government was defeated on an amendment to the budget in June 1885. They decided to resign rather than dissolve and Salisbury, at the Queen's request, formed a government. Known as the Caretaker Ministry, it was in office for 6 months. It was widely expected that the Fourth Party could expect promotion after their successful guerilla tactics; Churchill got the India Office and Balfour was

appointed President of the Local Government Board. It was not an exciting job, and Balfour did not fill it with any distinction. He found the work boring and became discouraged, particularly when he heard from his cousin that Salisbury was disappointed by his rather feeble performance.

In the general election of November 1885, Balfour was returned for a new constituency, Hertford having been abolished as a parliamentary borough. He did not seek a Scottish seat, but did, rather surprisingly, choose a large industrial one: East Manchester. The future government of Ireland was a main topic at the election and Balfour, in his election address, declared firmly against any form of Home Rule:

> To secure order, freedom and safety, for the minority as well as the majority of the Irish people, and to do so as far as possible by the administration of equal laws, should be the first object of any Ministry responsible for the government of the country. But I shall resist to the uttermost any attempt to loosen the connection which has subsisted so long between Ireland and Great Britain, under whatever disguises that attempt may be made (17).

As the election result left the Irish party holding the balance of power, the caretakers remained in office in the interval. Gladstone was coming round to the belief that some form of Home Rule would have to be proposed and he made an approach to Salisbury to ask if such a proposal could be promoted by both parties. The approach was made through Balfour. Gladstone's suggestion was either a statesmanlike effort to settle an almost impossible question or a desperate attempt to avoid a split in his own party,

depending on what construction one chooses to put on it. Salisbury, with Balfour's encouragement, put the second. In any event neither of them was interested in Home Rule to which they were determinedly opposed, nor could they be averse to the prospect of a split in the Liberal party. Gladstone's proposal was never seriously discussed and he, of course, went on to draft and introduce a Home Rule Bill alone.

Balfour did not take a major part in opposing the first Home Rule Bill. Probably, like many Conservatives, he was happy to leave much of the parliamentary work to those inside the Liberal party who felt they could not follow Gladstone. The Bill was defeated, 93 Liberals voting against its second reading. A general election followed, in July 1886, and produced a large majority against Gladstone. The Liberal Unionists, as the dissentient Liberals were becoming known, declined to enter a coalition government with the Tories, so Salisbury became Prime Minister of a purely Conservative administration. Both groups of Liberal Unionists, however, the Whigs led by Hartington and the Radicals led by Chamberlain, let it be known that they would broadly support the new government.

Balfour was given the new post of Secretary for Scotland: a promotion though he was still, initially, without a seat in the Cabinet. The coining of the phrase "Bob's your uncle" in reference to this appointment suggests that he was hardly seen as possessing the necessary attributes for government,

other, of course, than being the Prime Minister's nephew (18). The main business facing him was the continuing unrest in the crofting counties. Though the Crofters' Movement was anything but Conservative, a brief digression to look at it is worthwhile, as it was strongly influenced by Ireland.

In the Scottish crofting areas, the north west of the Highlands and the Islands, the pattern of agriculture and the problems of the tenantry were roughly similar to those in the west of Ireland. The crofters lived in considerable poverty, and in a permanent state of grumbling discontent with their unsympathetic landlords. They perceived the similarity of their position to that of the smaller tenants in Ireland, and their discontent was fanned into revolt by the example of the rise of the Irish Land League and the concessions of Gladstone's 1881 Irish Land Act. In fact, there was one important difference between the grievances of the 2 groups: in Ireland the central problem was that rents were too high, in Scotland it was scarcity of land. Trouble in Scotland began in Skye in the winter of 1880-81 when crofters determined to follow the Irish policy of refusing to pay rent.

By the beginning of 1883 an organisation on the lines of the Land League was founded. Called the Highland Land Law Reform Association, it later further underlined its debt to the Irish movement by changing its name to the Highland Land League. Its first President was Donald H. MacFarlane

who had been campaigning for the crofters for several years. MacFarlane was an interesting man: born in the Highlands, he had emigrated to Ireland and was the Nationalist M.P. for Carlow. With John Stuart Blackie he had provided an unofficial crofters' lobby before the establishment of the H.L.L.R.A.

Wary after their difficult experiences with the Irish League, the Liberals were reluctant to draw attention to the crofters by backing up the landlords with armed police or military. Nor did they wish to make martyrs. Harried by their own radicals and by the Irish M.P.s, the government appointed a Royal Commission to look into the crofters' grievances. The Napier Commission reported in 1884 but though their conclusions were sympathetic to the crofters, the latter were dissatisfied when the Commission's recommendations fell short of what the Irish had received in 1881. The Land War went on with tenants in Skye and South Uist further demonstrating their debt to Ireland by applying the methods of "boycott". It became evident to Gladstone, and even to those of less enlightened mind, that something would have to be done in the way of legislation for the crofters. A Bill was drafted, relying heavily on the Irish Land Act, and introduced in May 1885. It disappeared with Gladstone's government the next month, but was re-introduced when the Liberals returned to power the following year. The decision to return to the subject was encouraged by the arrival at Westminster of 4 "Crofters' M.P.s", led by G. B. Clark.

Both the main parties supported the measure and it was passed, becoming one of the few achievements of the short lived administration that tried to put through the first Irish Home Rule Bill. Even the Duke of Argyll, who had resigned from Gladstone's cabinet over the 1881 Irish Bill, and who was a strong apologist for the Highland landlords, accepted it. The 4 Crofters' M.P.s, however, did not, having discovered that over reliance on the Irish example had landed them with a Bill that did nothing for the crofters' chronic shortage of land. The extravagant praise that the Highlanders had heaped on the Irish Land Act had certainly helped them to get some legislation, Gladstone being extremely proud and attached to that Act, but it had ensured that they did not get the legislation they really wanted. Though the Irish Party supported the Crofters' M.P.s with both main parties backing the measure, it easily became law.

It was at this point that Balfour took over the Scottish Office. He had spoken in favour of the Crofters Act. He now took the view that concessions having been made, it was time to act firmly with the unrest that was still occurring, indeed had been heightened by dissatisfaction with the Act. Beginning in Tiree and then moving on to Skye, he sent troops to back the demoralised police and ordered the vigorous suppression of dissent. His actions were very different than those of his immediate predecessors who had been reluctant to continue intervention in the crofting counties and had hoped that the problem, if ignored, would

disappear. Lord Dalhousie, the Liberal whom Balfour succeeded, had remarked that he feared the presence of large numbers of troops held in readiness in the Highlands would make the government look faintly ridiculous (19). Balfour had no such worries and writs for the non-payment of rents and rates were swiftly served in Tiree and Skye. Highland landlords and their agents were delighted with Balfour, a delight only slightly lessened by his insistence that landlords in arrears with their rates payments should be proceeded against as well as their tenants.

Salisbury too was pleased with Balfour's firm action and his vigorous defences of it in the Commons. He gave Balfour a seat in the Cabinet. He was, however, shortly to leave the Scottish Office, after a tenure of only 7 months (20). Sir Michael Hicks Beach, the Irish Secretary, was forced to resign because his health, especially his eyesight, was failing. Since the rise of Parnell the post had been the most demanding and awkward of ministries. Hicks Beach was by no means the first Irish Secretary to have suffered physically under the demands of the job and the incessant harrying of the Irish members. Only Campbell-Bannerman had emerged unscathed and with his reputation enhanced after a period as Chief Secretary for Ireland. He was to be joined by Balfour, who Lord Salisbury now appointed to the post; almost the only thing the 2 men had in common.

This time there was relatively little fuss in political circles about nepotism. This was partly because no-one could

see the appointment as anything but a passport to pain and sorrow; and partly because the reaction was so much one of astonishment as to allow little room for any other emotions. Balfour was still considered to be a dilettante and politically a lightweight. Little thought was given to what he would make of the office, the general consensus being that he would not long survive in it. Nationalist Ireland greeted the appointment with derisive glee: United Ireland compared him to a daddy long-legs, and a leader in the Freeman's Journal, in a passage that was to become famous, said:

> It seems like breaking a butterfly on the wheel to extend Mr. Balfour on the rack of Irish politics. He is an elegant, fragile creature, a prey to that aristocratic languor which prevents him from assuming any but the limpest attitude. Mr. Balfour's whole life seems to be a protest against being called upon to do anything but sniff a heavily perfumed handkerchief while he sprawls in poses of studied carelessness on the benches of the House of Commons (21).

Inside his own party the appointment was received with surprised silence. Salisbury had chosen him and seemed confident that he would do a good job, a confidence no other senior Tory shared. In fact, Balfour was a great success and Lord George Hamilton, one of those Cabinet ministers who were so astonished at the appointment, was to write in his memoirs: "The history of the House of Commons for the next four years is really a record of Balfour's marvellous Parliamentary performances" (22). He was to embark on a joint programme for Ireland of ferocious coercion followed by conciliation.

His success, however, was fundamentally success only from the Tory point of view. Balfour himself continued to believe to the end of his life that he had achieved much in Ireland, both in combating crime and in passing constructive measures (23). His measures of conciliation were important in improving Irish conditions, but were not in themselves really significant until assisted later by further legislation. His much publicised coercionist policy was not an unqualified success either: it was less popular in Britain, even among Unionists, than Balfour believed; and the decrease in crime in the second half of his administration owed as much to the controversies over Parnell as it did to Balfour's firm hand.

What was important to Conservatives at the time, however, was that Balfour was seen to be doing something and believed to be doing it successfully. His appointment came at a time when the government was demoralised. Stafford Northcote had died suddenly, Hicks Beach's resignation was felt to be a serious loss. Churchill had resigned as Chancellor of the Exchequer. Salisbury had persuaded Goschen to take the post, a coup when many Tories felt uncertain about the Liberal Unionists and Chamberlain was holding talks to explore the possibility of re-union with the Liberals. A seat was found for Goschen since he had been defeated in 1886 and, to make matters worse, he promptly lost the by-election. Remarkably quickly, however, demoralisation gave way to appreciation of Balfour's work in Ireland. He soon became the hero of his party and his work seen as a triumph.

At the end of 1886 the 2 rising stars of Unionism were Churchill and Chamberlain, with Balfour a poor third. Five years later no-one questioned Balfour's accession to the leadership of the Commons or that one day he would be Prime Minister. To some extent Balfour was lucky: Chamberlain had refused office in the new Unionist administration, and Churchill's career faded with the sudden and dramatic collapse of his health. But the disappearance from office of his 2 rivals, temporary in Chamberlain's case, permanent in Churchill's, would not in itself have pushed forward Balfour's career so much had he not been considered such a success in the Irish office.

The average Tory member's knowledge of and interest in Ireland was not great or sustained. What above all endeared Balfour to his party, particularly its back benches, was the hatred that he increasingly aroused in the Irish Nationalist Party. The violence of the Irish response to Balfour and his coercion policy was remarkable. Remarks about his dilettanteism, the "painted butterfly", soon gave way to outraged condemnation of the ferocity of his repressive regime. He earned a new sobriquet: "Bloody Balfour". Question time and Irish debates produced wild scenes in the Commons as the Irish members attacked and insulted Balfour. Their tactics in the House which had proved so devastating to previous Irish Secretaries, Balfour met with cold indifference.

One example of the Irish nationalist response to Balfour may be quoted. It is from a book published in 1889 by

T. P. O'Connor, one of the more mild-mannered Parnellites. O'Connor introduces a detailed condemnation of Balfour's policy in a chapter entitled "The Regime of Brutality", with a sketch of Balfour's character:

> Such is Mr. Balfour; physically weak, morally false, effeminate in air and in temper - in short, just the man for a massacre.... The most dangerous and the most cruel of men are not the robust and the bold and the brutal tyrants. It is the men of effeminate minds and temper. Their vanity leads them to do things that look strong, and their effeminacy induces a certain tendency to political hysteria that has very cruel and very callous elements. It will be seen by-and-by that Mr. Balfour's acts fully justify this conception of his character (24).

It is perhaps worth saying something here of an Irishman who reacted very differently to Balfour, though it somewhat breaks the thread of the general argument. Michael J. F. McCarthy was an anti-clerical propagandist writing in the first 20 years of this century. McCarthy came from County Cork, was educated at Trinity College Dublin and became a barrister. He was a Unionist, but his principal interest became attacking the influence of the Catholic church in Ireland. From 1901 he published a series of 16 books. They all, more or less, advanced the same thesis: that Ireland's problems and backwardness were attributable to the power and pervasiveness of the Catholic clergy. The most famous of his works was aptly and catchily titled Priests and People in Ireland, which was very successful and ran through many editions.

As a Unionist, McCarthy admired Balfour's work in Ireland. He could never accept, however, the fact that Balfour was

prepared to sanction, and even encourage, the establishment of a new university in the south of Ireland that would be de facto, if not de jure, Catholic. As he wrote in another of his books:

> No one can more truly say that he has admired Mr. Balfour than I can. I discovered and appreciated his worth, when there were very very few in Ireland to admit it. But I must say that I detect a false ring in all he has ever said about this Catholic University question (25).

McCarthy may have had his reservations about Balfour, but he had enormous respect and admiration for Scotland as a country. In 1904 he was invited to speak in Edinburgh by Thomas Chalmers' niece, Isabel. He took as the theme for his lecture the contrast between Scotland and Ireland. The contrast, not surprisingly, was that Scotland was predominantly Presbyterian and thus contented and successful, while Ireland was predominantly Catholic, discontented and poor.

> Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales, Manxland and Cornwall are Celtic and Protestant and they are prosperous. Southern Ireland is Celtic and Catholic and it is not prosperous. Is it not clear, therefore, that it is to religion and not to race that Southern Ireland must trace her unhappy condition?

He delivered a long diatribe against the priests in Ireland, balanced by a eulogy of Calvin and Knox. And he contrasted too the Scots in Ulster with the Catholic Irish immigrants in Scotland.

> It is they who give Ireland the lead, not ostentatiously but none the less effectively in all that is solid and practical, in everything conducive to settled prosperity, to the maintenance of law and order, and to the lasting benefit of the country.... If you examine the position of the Catholic Irish settlement in Scotland, you will find, on the contrary, that its social and commercial status is the reverse of all that I have said of the Protestant Scotch settlement in Ireland (26).

To return to Balfour as Chief Secretary, what really set his years in the office apart was, as has been mentioned, the firm application of coercion. It is, therefore, worth saying something about coercion. It was, of course, anything but new. As Balfour rejoiced in pointing out, it had been as much Liberal as Conservative policy in the early 1880s. Indeed, before Balfour the Chief Secretary whose name had become most synonymous with coercion was a Liberal, W. E. "Buckshot" Forster. Three things singled out and highlighted Balfour's approach. The first was the conversion of the bulk of the Liberals to Home Rule. This meant that they had now an alternative and positive policy to offer in Ireland and implied that they would no longer be looking to coercion as a method of governing Ireland: it had ceased to be a consensus policy between the 2 British parties. Secondly Balfour succeeded Conservative politicians who had tried to placate rather than antagonise Ireland: notably Hicks Beach, whose tone had been conciliatory, and Lord Carnarvon, who had flirted with Home Rule in 1885.

Thirdly, and most significantly, Balfour determined to back his officials, particularly the police and the resident magistrates, at all times. This included times when they had clearly over-reacted to the threat of violence and broken the law themselves. Coercion, for the first time, meant giving the authorities an almost completely free hand. The decision to adopt this attitude by Balfour was a result of his own personal approach to, and view of, Ireland.

Balfour disliked Ireland. There were, of course, many politicians from both parties who were intensely irritated by Ireland and resented the intractability of the Irish problem and the amount of parliamentary time it occupied. But with Balfour it went deeper than a general dissatisfaction. He was a convinced Imperialist with a strong attachment to the ideal of the British Empire. It was inconceivable to him that the Empire could prosper and continue to extend its influence if the British Isles did not stay united. He could never see anything in the argument that federalism could be a source of strength and believed it to be not just foolish but wicked to advocate division of an area so geographically small as Britain and Ireland.

Curiously of course his name has become associated with nationalism: the Balfour declaration on Palestine. Any reading of his career, however, can only see this as an isolated event. In general he loathed nationalism. He opposed Scottish Home Rule as vigorously as Irish, partly because it was at odds with his own image of Scotland. For he was fond of extolling the lack of nationalism in Scotland and exhorting the Irish to become more like the Scots in this respect. He did not deny that the Scots were proud of their country, indeed he claimed to share this pride himself. But their loyalty he believed lay principally to Britain, and only secondly to Scotland. This attitude he would conclude made them better patriots than the Irish. On one occasion he coined the unhappy phrase "subordinate

patriotism" to encompass and extoll the loyal Scot's feelings (27).

Balfour's dislike of Ireland was not only an intellectual opposition to the nationalism that he felt Ireland stood for. He could never accept the emotional side of nationalism: he was a great believer in emigration as a solution to many of the problems of Ireland and of the Highlands of Scotland. It was for this reason that he placed as much emphasis on conciliation as he did on coercion; he genuinely believed in the possibility of "killing Home Rule with kindness", and expected that a rise in Irish prosperity would bring a decline in the demands of Irish nationalism. As that perceptive contemporary critic E. T. Raymond wrote:

> But it never seems to have occurred to him that vulgar people, too, have their own imponderables, ... he could not understand the irrational affection of common men for the land of their birth (28).

Such a view of the "common men" was not unusual among the late Victorian upper classes. Balfour combined it with a personal contempt for the Celtic Irish people that was strongly tinged with racism. He was a convinced Anglo-Saxonist, one of the most fervent believers in the superiority and destiny of the Anglo-Saxon race, and this led him to the belief that the Irish were unfit for self-government. Horace Plunkett recorded of a conversation with Balfour:

> The most interesting thing he said was that he utterly distrusted the governing qualities of the Irish or, indeed, their driving capacity; clever, voluble, ineffective - not trustworthy in business, and so forth (29).

Much of this attitude he shared with his uncle. Salisbury had once remarked, in a sentence that became famous, when discussing Home Rule and its desirability or otherwise: "You would not confide free representative institutions to the Hottentots, for instance". The implied comparison caused an uproar in Ireland and it nicely illustrated Salisbury's latent racism, the Cecil contempt for the rest of mankind, and his gift for offensive public remarks.

Central to Balfour's belief that the Irish were not really fit to govern themselves was his insistence that all that was best in Irish society had been imported from England. Time after time in opposing the Home Rule Bills, both of 1893 and 1913, he returned to this point. Winding up for the opposition on the second reading of the 1893 Bill he said: "all the law and all the civilization in Ireland are the work of England" (30). Speaking of the imminent introduction of the 1913 Bill in London he declared:

> You would suppose, to hear the Home Rulers talk, that a Parliament in Ireland was an Irish invention. It is an English invention. You would suppose that when England gradually became the paramount power in Ireland, it destroyed a civilised unity. That is really no representation of the facts.

All the Irish had had was a "tribal system" under which "it was perfectly impossible either economically or in any other way to rise to a higher grade of civilization" (31).

If the Irish had been unable to organise themselves in the twelfth century, Balfour saw no reason why they should do any better in the late nineteenth. Other examples could be quoted of his contempt for the Celtic peoples: his dislike

of the Scottish Highlands; his comment on the Irish famine that it had "beyond all doubt enormously improved the well-being of the Irish agriculturist"; his enthusiastic comparison of himself to Cromwell as an Irish administrator; or his claim that if Ireland had less ordinary crime than Britain it was because the immigrant Irish were responsible for most of the crime in the British cities (32).

The detailed history of Balfour's years at the Irish office is readily available and will not be repeated here (33). A brief survey only will be given, picking up various interesting points to illustrate Balfour's attitudes to his work, and looking at some Scottish reactions to it.

Balfour had no breathing space to accustom himself to his new office, but was immediately involved in highly contentious legislation. A Crimes Act had been drafted: not that difficult a task as its authors had plenty of precedent to work from. It was decided though to make this Act permanent, rather than operational for a fixed period as previously. A fortnight after taking office Balfour made his first speech as Chief Secretary: on a motion of W. H. Smith's to give the Crimes Act parliamentary precedence. Six days later Balfour introduced the Act, which was to take up the bulk of 3 months parliamentary time. His speech was not judged a success; certainly it was a baptism of fire. His biographer recorded: "For the first quarter of an hour ... the Irish Party stared in silent curiosity; after that they had heard enough in silence and he was subjected to incessant interruption, Parnell leading the heckling" (34).

As Balfour recalled later, he carried nearly all the 3 months of debates on the Act himself, Hicks Beach being out of commission.

> I had the luck to do it all myself. There was literally no one to help me. Night after night I had to stand up in the House and defend myself to that raging lot opposite, and no one to say a word for me. Old W. H. Smith would put in some generalities occasionally, but nobody knew the facts but me (35).

It must have been a considerable struggle, but it made him. By the time the Act became law Tory doubts about Balfour had mostly evaporated, the Irish were changing their minds about his powers of perseverance and endurance; and Salisbury was congratulating himself on making the appointment. It is interesting in this context to follow the progress of the Act through the columns of the Glasgow Herald. The Herald was in favour of the Act, and ran a series of leaders expounding on its necessity in March 1887 when it was first presented. But these articles made no mention of Balfour, concentrating on the high incidence of Irish crime. This soon changed and it became Balfour's Bill, and it became Balfour's handling of it that attracted favourable comment. Balfour had, of course, more tangible press help from The Times who published the famous Pigott forgeries on the day of the second reading.

Three days after the passing of the Crimes Act Balfour was back with his first measure of conciliation, a Land Act. Somewhat to his surprise, he had nearly as much trouble with it as he had had with the coercion measure. Not only did the Irish and the Liberals dislike it, feeling that it did

too little for Irish tenants; his own party disliked it too for the opposite reason. The history of the year from the summer of 1887, however, is really the story of the application of the Crimes Act. The National League was "proclaimed" as a first step to destroying the Plan of Campaign (36). In September occurred perhaps the most famous, or infamous, incident associated with Balfour's coercionist regime: the melee at Mitchelstown. "Remember Mitchelstown" thundered Gladstone and people did remember this affray in which the police displaying panic, if not something worse, shot 3 people dead. The authorities remembered Mitchelstown too, as did the Unionists, for Balfour's handling of the incident. As the future Ulster leader Edward Carson recalled:

> It was Mitchelstown that made us certain we had a man at last. That affair was badly muddled. But Balfour never admitted anything. He simply backed his own people up. After that there wasn't an official in Ireland who didn't worship the ground he walked on. He never boggled about anything (37).

Carson was one, the most ruthless and ultimately successful, of the new men that Balfour brought into the Irish administration which he found in a very demoralised state. Salisbury had written to Balfour in characteristic vein:

> It is borne in upon me, as I suppose it is on most people - that you have the stupidest lot of lawyers in Ireland any govt. was ever connected with (38).

As well as backing the police Balfour now introduced Carson, as a travelling prosecutor; Sir West Ridgeway, as a thoroughly non-compromising permanent Under-Secretary; George Wyndham, later to be Chief Secretary himself, as his private secretary; and Peter O'Brien, "Peter the Packer",

as Attorney-General. They were a determined and unflappable team who cheerfully disregarded all the criticism levelled at them and their officials and police. Balfour became closest to Carson; the latter's biographer remarking that Balfour "became almost an object of worship for the young lawyer" (39). Carson wrote to Balfour after they had been working together for 2 years: "To have won your appreciation is to me the highest honour" (40).

In the opinion of the leading historian of Balfour's rule in Ireland, he did succeed in breaking up the National League (41). Coercion, however, had its failures, both comic and tragic. Balfour determined to end special prison treatment for those arrested under the Crimes Act, even if they were members of the Irish Parliamentary Party. As he said in a speech to his constituents in December 1887:

> Mere abuse could be treated with contempt; but when it comes to open advocacy of crime, when men who come over here and speak softly to the English people, go back to Ireland and urge the excitable peasantry of that country to resist the law, then, I say to them, you have passed the bounds of political discussion; then, I say, you have ceased to be politicians and you have become criminals, and as criminals I shall proceed against you (42).

The incident that had sparked off the riot in Mitchelstown was the arrest of William O'Brien, M.P. and leader of the plan of campaign, and of John Mandeville, a local farmer. In due course both were imprisoned, and demonstrated the comic and tragic sides of coercion. Mandeville was treated so harshly that he subsequently died (43). O'Brien, denying stoutly that he was a criminal, refused to wear the prison

clothes. Questions were asked in the Commons and "O'Brien's trousers" attracted some fame, as did his decision during a later period in prison to go on constipation strike. His colleague John Dillon was not robust and many feared that a spell in prison might kill him as it had Mandeville, and create a very major martyr. These episodes did not help the administration of coercion: Balfour was made to look both foolish and cruel.

He, however, was not at all discomposed or discouraged. Sticking to the line that all who broke the laws on meetings and speeches would be proceeded against no matter who they were, he also sanctioned the gathering up of those from Britain who involved themselves in the land disputes. Another embarrassing incident was caused when C. A. V. Conybeare, the radical member for Cornwall North West, claimed to have caught crab lice in an Irish prison (44). Perhaps the most famous Englishman to be imprisoned was the distinguished if wearisome poet, traveller and horseman W. S. Blunt; scourge of British administration in Egypt and Ireland. Balfour continued to be unmoved though Blunt was an acquaintance and the cousin both of George Wyndham and of Balfour's mistress. Balfour said of him at the time in typically laconic fashion: "he is a goodish poet and a goodish lawn tennis player and a goodish fellow"; Salisbury obviously considered him more of a troublemaker than a "goodish fellow" for he professed himself "delighted to see you had run Wilfred Blunt in" (45).

On his release, however, Blunt made public his version of some conversations he had had with Balfour at a house party. Describing Balfour as cold and hard, he claimed that Balfour had admitted to wishing to use imprisonment to physically weaken and even kill some of the nationalist leaders, in particular John Dillon (46). Balfour remained insouciant, but eventually was forced to rebutt Blunt's assertions with some vehemence in a speech. In fact, Balfour, encouraged by Salisbury who was appalled at the idea of Dillon becoming a martyr and thus being "far more formidable dead than alive", was careful to ensure that while Dillon should be suitably miserable in prison, he should not actually physically deteriorate. He wrote to his permanent Under-Secretary:

> I think we should have very frequent reports of Dillon's health, not less frequent than twice a week. While I am on the one hand anxious that he should not be allowed to suffer by being imprisoned, I am equally anxious on the other that there should be no relaxation of prison discipline in his favour which is not absolutely required by his condition of health (47).

In general, however, Balfour was happy to promote his image of inflexibility and hard-heartedness. Though alive to the political dangers in Britain of excessive toughness, with his contempt for the Irish he was genuinely uncaring of what was thought of him there, and always believed that resistance would be overcome, or at least worn down, by continued determination.

He must have been grateful, when he was just setting out with coercion, for the assistance given to his case by The Times' "Parnellism and Crime" articles. When it became

clear that some form of enquiry would have to be conducted into The Times' allegations, in particular the supposed letters from Parnell, he made the decision with Salisbury and W. H. Smith to appoint a Statutory Commission. Parnell had wanted a Select Committee of the House, or an enquiry to look only at the letters, but Balfour had firmly opposed this:

> Nothing is finally decided as to the course we are going to take with regard to Parnell except that under no circumstances shall we allow the case to go before a Parliamentary Committee of Enquiry (48).

It seems that Balfour feared, through his police and secret service network, that the letters were very suspect and thus insisted on a full investigation of all the possible links between the Irish Party and crime. Certainly he was careful not to attach any importance to the letters in public and, indeed, to distance himself from the whole question. Speaking before the Commission met, he said:

> I have never relied on the accusations advanced by The Times; I have always found sufficient material for my political controversies in the contemporary facts of Irish history. I have never had to go back beyond the year 1885 to prove that the Irish leaders desired to obtain what they call the freedom of their country by illegal and anarchic means.... The case that I have made ... against the Gladstone-Parnellite Party will not be one whit weekend if every single word in the pamphlet "Parnellism and Crime" were proved to be a baselsss accusation (49).

Nonetheless he did give The Times all the help that he could in preparing their defence of their articles, while denying publicly that he was doing so (50). He tried hard too to make the best of the Commission's findings; endeavouring with little success to direct public attention away from

the Pigott forgeries and towards the general conclusions which were critical of the Parnellites.

The whole episode of the Commission and the letters damaged the government's standing in both Britain and Ireland. Curtis suggests that for Balfour it had one positive outcome: it helped to persuade his party to back him in the continuing promotion of measures of conciliation. Many Tories were unenthusiastic about legislation to improve conditions in Ireland. Balfour was also to an extent the victim of his own success: with Ireland seeming more peaceful much of his own party could not see the need for concessions. The improvement of the standard of life in Ireland was, however, as we have seen, central to Balfour's approach. As he once said:

> Cromwell failed because he relied solely on repressive measures. That mistake I shall not imitate - I shall be as relentless as Cromwell in forcing obedience to the law, but, at the same time, I shall be as radical as any reformer in redressing grievances, and especially in removing every cause of complaint in regard to the land. It is on the twofold aspect of my policy that I rely for success (51).

He believed that the agitation for Home Rule was not only fuelled but also inspired by distress in Ireland, particularly rural distress. So he was convinced that if he could solve the land problem the Home Rule demand would in time fade away. To some extent he shared this belief with an unlikely ally: John Dillon always feared that "killing Home Rule with kindness" might work and wished to resist Unionist concessions for this reason.

Balfour put most faith in land purchase: the gradual transfer, with the government as intermediary of land from the landlord to the tenant. He put through 2 measures to encourage land purchase, in 1888 and 1891. Both of them, owing mainly to their extreme complexity were, however, relatively unsuccessful and underused. He had come a long way since his objections to the 1881 Land Act. Indeed, so far was he prepared to go in ignoring basic Conservative principles to try and break the desire for Home Rule, that he favoured using compulsion to force reluctant landlords to sell. His uncle agreed with him, but they could not hope to take their party with them, and the scheme was left voluntary.

Balfour also passed some measures for the relief of the poorest parts of Ireland, the so-called "Congested Districts" in the west. At times he sanctioned, though reluctantly, the distribution of food and he organised a programme of works, especially the building of light railways, to provide employment and stimulate the local economy. In the Land Purchase Act of 1891 he established the Congested Districts Board which did much to encourage modern methods of farming and fishing and set up small industries. It says much for the Board that even such dedicated opponents of Balfourian rule as O'Brien and Davitt in time came to praise its work, and that it persuaded many ordinary people in Ireland that there was some humanity to be found in Balfour. He himself was extremely proud of the Board and of land purchase, particularly after it was extended by the Wyndham Act of 1903 when he was Prime Minister.

The second Land Purchase Act had not been welcomed by Parnell and his party. Parnell set out his objections to it not only in the Commons, but also in an article in the North American Review. It was not a very strong article since Parnell's objections were not deep-rooted and related mainly to details (52). Nonetheless he pitched in with gusto:

> But this pretended Land-Purchase Bill is no solution. It seizes upon all our available resources and hypothecates them without our consent. It jobs away the limited number of millions available, which, if husbanded and carefully directed, as I have shown, would go far - very far - toward removing all pressure and difficulty in the future. It selects the large and absentee owners for favoured treatment, while it compels the tenant to buy his holding at an inflated price, with a load of arrears around his neck and the pistol of coercion at his head. We cannot be a party to any measure so brought forward and constituted.

In the next issue of the periodical Balfour published "Mr. Parnell Answered". We have seen that normally Balfour devoted little energy to rebutting Irish critics, confining even his statements in parliament to the acceptable minimum. On this occasion, however, he went carefully through all Parnell's objections to the Bill and replied to them one by one. He concluded that Parnell really opposed the Act for the same reason that Balfour wished to promote it: that Parnell feared that if it were successful it would undermine the Home Rule movement. Parnell's approach to the land question, he asserted, was that he wished to keep "embittering it in the interests of a political revolution" (53).

The point here, of course, was that Balfour took the trouble to reply, and to deal with Parnell's objections in detail,

precisely because the original article had appeared in the North American Review. It was America's most prestigious periodical and, while he might care little for what was thought of him and his policy in Ireland, he did care very deeply what was thought in America. The Americans were people who counted in Balfour's world, and he was anxious that they should not get a false impression of what he was trying to do. For the same reason he accepted an invitation to submit an article in December 1892 on the forthcoming Home Rule Bill (54).

Less than 6 months after they had clashed in the North American Review, Parnell had lost the leadership of the bulk of his party and was battling for his survival, after the revelations in the divorce court. Balfour had his chance to use the crisis for political advantage, being given advance warning of the case by O'Shea himself, in a letter clearly inviting him to do so. Balfour, to his credit, was anxious neither to use the crisis for his own ends, nor to get involved with O'Shea. He replied:

> It would be impertinent in me, a comparative stranger, to comment on the distressing family matters to which your communication refers. It deals with a subject necessarily painful, and of which the painfulness must, I fear, necessarily be increased by the publicity which would seem to be now forced upon you. I sincerely trust that no aggravation of inevitable suffering may be brought about by the unwarrantable introduction of political and party feeling into private affairs, from which, in my opinion, they should be wholly dissociated (55).

It must be said that Balfour had no need to encourage the "unwarrantable introduction of political and party feeling

into private affairs" as the Liberal and Irish parties were happily doing it for him. He followed the development of the case and its aftermath with cool detachment and cynicism, writing to his uncle: "What an amusing crisis this is. However it turns out nobody can deny that we have had our fun for our money". Parnell's struggle to re-assert himself he observed without interest and unmoved, though even Salisbury had expressed his admiration for Parnell's courage and determination (56). Balfour had another reason for not sounding off publicly about immorality. Like Parnell he was a bachelor with a married mistress. His love was Mary Wyndham, cousin of George Wyndham (and also of W. S. Blunt), now Viscountess Elcho; and eventually to become Countess of Wemyss and live like Balfour in East Lothian, at Gosford. Their "intimacy", as Lady Elcho called it, seems to have begun around 1885 and lasted at least into the new century. There seems, not surprisingly, to have been suspicions aroused inside their families, including the lady's husband, but Balfour's affair was discreet and little-known; perhaps because it was mostly conducted in Scotland rather than London. Certainly, unlike for example Lord Hartington, it was unknown in political circles: Balfour's silence, nonetheless, must be his only case of showing solidarity, albeit tacitly, with Parnell.

Some effort has been made to convey the enthusiasm for Balfour and his work that emerged during his 4 years as Chief Secretary for Ireland. Though there were reservations amongst the radical wing of the Liberal Unionists, he became

the hero of the Tory party. Nowhere was this enthusiasm more marked than in Scotland. In 1889 it was decided to hold a function in his honour in Edinburgh. This in itself was not unusual, giving dinners to prominent men was a favourite Victorian political pastime.

Various things, however, do single out what came to be known as the "Balfour Demonstration", which consisted of a banquet and, on the following day, a mass meeting. The most obvious was its size. Secondly, it was held specifically to recognise the work he had done and was doing in Ireland: normally such functions were seen as general celebrations of a leader without reference to any particular facet of his work. Thirdly, it was the first to be organised jointly by the Conservative and Liberal Unionist parties. Finally, it was surely held as a direct response to the granting of the freedom of Edinburgh to Parnell and the mass meetings that had been organised around that event. The Unionists of Scotland, and particularly of course of Edinburgh, had been deeply affronted by the decision of the Liberal majority on Edinburgh's Town Council to make Parnell a burgess. A vigorous but unsuccessful campaign had been run against the decision. Having lost that battle, the Unionists decided to run their own celebration of all that Parnell abhorred 5 months later, by feting their local leader.

The banquet was, according to its sponsors, the "greatest" in size ever held in Scotland. No building could be found in Edinburgh large enough to accommodate all those who

wished to attend. A wooden pavilion was accordingly constructed in Waverley market. The platform party consisted of 60 and a further 2400 "gentlemen sat down to the dinner". Galleries accommodated 1200 ladies, though they had to rely on the mental food of the speeches, being denied the physical sustenance of the dinner.

The banquet was chaired by the Duke of Fife, recently elevated to a dukedom on marrying a daughter of the Prince of Wales. In proposing Balfour's health, he assured his audience that their guest was being honoured not as a partisan but as the upholder of the principles of law and order:

> I will endeavour in these few and imperfect remarks, failing other merits, to avoid the very mention of those well-worn syllables, Home Rule, because I maintain that our guest of this evening is not so much the champion of the Unionist cause as the successful administrator of laws which, however vilified, are absolutely necessary where the elementary conditions of society are attacked.

As was customary on such occasions there were a formidable number of speeches. The bulk of them must have been dull enough at the time, and are more so in retrospect; and only a couple of them need be mentioned. A Professor Henry Calderwood spoke, and he was something of a coup for the organisers; for he was a radical Liberal Unionist who declared himself proud to have been invited to address the banquet and happy to praise what Balfour was doing (57). The Duke of Abercorn spoke on behalf of Ulster and said how much that province appreciated Balfour's work. As the representative of Ulster he was especially enthusiastically

welcomed by the diners; though he did also have strong Scottish connections.

Balfour himself spoke, of course, making the major contribution to the evening's entertainment. He thanked the audience for their welcome and kindness, but assured them that they were honouring the government's policy and, taking up Fife's point, the principle of the maintenance of law and order, rather than him personally. He had no doubt that the Scots were better patriots, in the true sense of the term, than the Irish. But he asked his audience to remember how unpopular the Union had been in Scotland until its benefits gradually became clear. The same process would occur in Ireland, whose Union was a century younger. To further illustrate this point, he instanced the Presbyterians in Ulster. They had opposed the Union, yet they "are now its chief defenders".

> Go to Ireland at this moment and travel through it and you will find that all that is best in learning, all that is best in literature, all that shows the greatest aptitude in commerce, all that exhibits the great qualities that make Scotland what it is, and are making the North of Ireland as Scotland is, you find all those forces arrayed upon the side of the Union.

In time this appreciation of the Union would spread in Ireland. But, it had to be admitted, it might spread only so far; that, however, was no argument for Home Rule. For those who opposed the Union through and through would never accept Home Rule as a final settlement; they would always seek complete separation. To them Home Rule could be "only a half-way house to an absolutely independent national Parliament".

The proceedings terminated amidst general enthusiasm, and the gentlemen left the wooden pavilion to make way for the masses the next evening. The diners had mostly been drawn, as one would expect, from the landed, commercial and legal worlds. They included some 20 provosts and bailies, and 9 Edinburgh University professors, counting Calderwood who had spoken. In this category came Professor Sellar, son of the infamous Highland factor Patrick Sellar, and Professor A. Campbell Fraser, professor of law, who will be mentioned below. Also present was S. H. Butcher, professor of Greek, best remembered now as Andrew Lang's collaborator in a new translation of the Odyssey. Butcher was a friend of Balfour's, and was also an Irish landlord, owning an estate in Co. Kerry; he, therefore, had abundant reasons for attending (58). Twenty newspaper editors attended, including the editor of the Glasgow Herald. Cooper of The Scotsman did not come but sent in his apologies and an assistant; whether he had another engagement or felt that he could not yet face such a massing of his old enemies and new friends is unclear. Others present included R. Fitzroy Bell, collaborator with Henley on the Scots Observer; William Blackwood, the publisher; Charles Baxter, Robert Louis Stevenson's oldest friend; Austen Chamberlain, Joe's son; and Robert Rowand Anderson, Scotland's leading architect.

By the next evening the pavilion had been adapted to accommodate the 10,000 who came to the mass meeting. The chair was taken by the Duke of Buccleuch, and an address was presented to Balfour "in name of the Unionists of Scotland,

expressing their unanimous approval of his Irish policy and promise of support in the future". Balfour devoted the bulk of his speech to a defence of the Crimes Act, which he insisted was proving successful. Perhaps in deference to his Chairman, the old adversary of Midlothian, he then turned to attack Gladstone at length. He accused Gladstone of not only conniving at but encouraging persistent breaking of the law. But even Gladstone deserved their sympathy when one considered a recent meeting of the Glasgow Liberal Association. This organisation had favoured Scottish Home Rule, the abolition of the House of Lords, the payment of M.P.s, an 8 hour day for miners and universal free education.

Gladstone had no desire to encourage such wild radicalism. But he would be forced to support such ideas as the price of continued radical support for Irish Home Rule.

> Ladies and Gentlemen, it is amusing to watch Mr. Gladstone's dismay in the face of resolutions such as those of the Gladstonian Liberal Association. He does not know what to say, or what to do. In vain he throws over, here an old pledge, there an old friend, there an old principle. He cannot keep up in this race. He is entirely outstripped by those who profess to call themselves his followers.... What the Gladstonians now desire to do is to persuade every man in the country that the portal through which his own particular millenium is to be reached is Home Rule, and nothing but Home Rule. If, therefore, you desire Disestablishment, if you desire free education, vote for Home Rule. If you desire an Eight Hours Bill, vote for Home Rule. If you desire to plunder the landlords, vote for Home Rule. If you desire anything, however wild, however foolish, however unprincipled, however opposed it may be to the traditional wisdom of mankind, vote for Home Rule.

Later in the meeting 2 Liberal Unionists spoke briefly. A. R. D. Elliot declared "I stand here and I say that we

are proud of an alliance which has so greatly benefited the people". The other Liberal Unionist opened his contribution by saying:

> I attend this great demonstration in a twofold capacity. I am here as a brother Scot, proud of and thankful for the Scotsman you have sent to Ireland, and I am here also as an Irish representative - a representative of that nobler and better Ireland than the one that is constantly held up by the party politician.

He was T. W. Russell, M.P. for South Tyrone. Born in Fife in 1841, he had married an Ulster girl and settled in Ireland, in Dublin. He had unsuccessfully contested Preston as a Liberal in 1885. Becoming a Liberal Unionist in 1886, he was returned in Tyrone, defeating William O'Brien. He was one of the most voluble of Unionists in this period, frequently speaking in Scotland and writing to the Scottish press. He became a favourite campaigner to the Scots Observer who never tired of praising his skill and vision. He was briefly a Junior Minister in the Local Government Board in 1900. In the election of 1906, however, he returned to his original party allegiance and managed to hold his seat. He remained a Liberal for the rest of his career and was appointed by Birrell to succeed Sir Horace Plunkett as Vice President of the Irish Department of Agriculture in 1907. He continued to hold this post during the coalition of the First World War and after, resigning in 1919. Created a baronet in 1917, he died in 1920.

The Balfour Demonstration was accounted a considerable success by Scottish Unionists. It had certainly shown a number of things: their pride in Balfour, their interest in

Ireland, their desire to support Ulster, their wish to see crime and Home Rule equally suppressed, and the following Balfour had developed in Scotland in a comparatively short time. Because they had felt affronted by the granting of the freedom of Edinburgh to Parnell, because they were the minority party in Scotland, and because they felt that in Balfour they had a real success to celebrate, such an enormous effort involving so many people, both speakers and spoken to, was made (59).

Impressive though it was a more remarkable tribute was to be paid to him in October 1891, the month he left the Irish office. He had just been elected to his second rectorship, in Glasgow, when John Inglis, Chancellor of Edinburgh University since 1868, died. We have seen how university elections for rectors were a part of the political scene in Scotland. Edinburgh's Chancellor was elected too, by the university's graduates. The Chancellor was the titular head of the university, and the post was something, therefore, of an honour. At the next half-yearly meeting of the General Council, the graduates' body, Balfour was chosen to succeed Inglis, an extraordinary tribute to one so young. The post was for life and Balfour duly held it for close on 40 years. He had been proposed by Professor Campbell Fraser and seconded by Dr. Joseph Bell, the man who had taught Conan Doyle and was alleged by some to be the model for Sherlock Holmes. No other candidate being offered, Balfour's election went straight through (60).

The university's records are simply terse and factual on the appointment and there is, therefore, no concrete evidence, but one can surely presume that, as with the Balfour Demonstration, it was his work in Ireland that prompted the great honour that was paid to Balfour. He was respected in the university for his philosophical work and had been invited to give a course of lectures on philosophy earlier in the year, which had, according to the Principal, met "with general approval" (61). So the university community must have had Balfour in their minds and, when Inglis died, decided he would be an acceptable and presentable Chancellor. But had it not been for his work in Ireland, he would never have been considered. Certainly one can reasonably say that it was Balfour's Irish policy that might have prompted Bell to be his seconder, for Bell made no secret of his dislike of the nationalist Irish (62).

Two weeks before he was elected Chancellor of Edinburgh University, he had left the Irish office to become leader of the House of Commons. Balfour replaced W. H. Smith, one of the figures he had enjoyed ridiculing in his Fourth Party days: Smith had since proved a surprisingly popular and successful leader in the previous 4 years. Curiously enough, he died on the same day as Parnell. Salisbury did not hesitate before giving Balfour the job. His decision was approved in the party, though tempered with regret at the departure of Balfour from Ireland.

In fact, Balfour's great days were over. He was to lead his party in the Commons and then, after Salisbury's retirement

in 1902, overall, for 20 years. He was to encourage and assist some more conciliatory legislation for Ireland; he was to run a strong and successful campaign against the second Home Rule Bill in 1893; he was to pass the Education Act of 1902 in the face of bitter opposition. But the excitement his name caused was not to last or return and he was not again considered an inspiration to his party, nor the saviour of his party.

Rather, in the years after he became Prime Minister, he irritated his followers. When Chamberlain unveiled his plans for tariff reform it quickly became clear that here was a dispute that could break up the Tory Party. Balfour, who several times in his life referred to the horror of becoming another Peel and splitting one's party, determined to keep the Conservatives, and indeed the Unionist alliance, together. He thus, in a contemporary phrase, "nailed his colours to the fence" on the issue (63). He succeeded in his object of preserving unity. But he was not respected for his manoeuverings and people began to speak again of his sophistry, his posing, his lack of genuine belief and commitment. The spell of the years at the Irish office was wearing off. At this point Balfour led his party to its greatest electoral defeat. The collapse of the Unionist vote in the 1906 election was not entirely his fault. He had not been the one to produce the bombshell of protection, and the disaster also owed something to a simple desire for change for its own sake among the electorate: the Unionists had been almost continuously in office for 20 years. But

the blame landed on him, and his ineffective opposition leadership over the next few years did not restore his position. Though 12 years younger than the new Prime Minister, Balfour began to look the old man, the politician who events had overtaken and passed by. By 1910 an increasing number of Tories were taking as their watchword "B.M.G.", "Balfour Must Go". Go he eventually did, in November 1911; only to embark on the third major phase of his career almost immediately.

Inside this brief sketch, it is worth continuing to consider in greater detail his attitude to Ireland in the years from 1891 to 1914. A proposal for Irish local government, organised by Balfour while he was still Chief Secretary, came up in 1892. He had been encouraged to introduce something on these lines by Chamberlain, always the champion of the need for and benefits of local government. The Bill proposed, however, pleased no-one and was eventually withdrawn. Instead of modelling it on the existing local provisions in Britain, the Bill had offered more limited local control and elaborate safeguards for the minority in Ireland. It departed unmourned, having left the impression that Balfour did not even consider the Irish fit for county government. The problem was eventually satisfactorily resolved in 1898 by his brother Gerald in a Bill setting up county and district councils such as existed in England and Scotland.

A few months after the abortive local government act a general election was called. The result was a victory for

Gladstone and the Irish Party, but not a major victory. As Gladstone, now 83, settled down to prepare a Home Rule Bill, Balfour settled down, with a light heart to oppose. He had been safely returned in Manchester, though with a slightly reduced majority. After the years at the Irish office he must have been glad of a respite. He was confident of his arguments on Home Rule and prepared to expound them frequently and at length. For the first time, in one sense, he was able to express all the ideas on which his Irish policy had been implicitly built; and it was easier to oppose than propose.

Balfour's energy in the course of the Home Rule Bill of 1893 surprised even his admirers. As his main adviser he looked to Carson now, partly thanks to Balfour's help, Unionist M.P. for Dublin University (64). Balfour decided to not only oppose the principle of the Home Rule proposal, but also to debate and fight every clause in it. He argued that it only strengthened the force of the argument against Home Rule to try and improve on every detail of it, to point out every absurdity and inconsistency, and to force the government into the use of the closure. Gladstone's almost despairing appeal to accept the principle and then calmly debate the details, was lost on Balfour who determined to attack both the principle and the details (65).

The main difference between the 1893 Bill and its predecessor was the proposal to retain Irish members at Westminster when Home Rule came into operation, with the right to vote

on imperial, but not purely British measures. This idea Balfour said would change the whole essence of parliament and would destory the traditions of parliament, built up over the centuries. As we have seen, the unfortunate Gladstone had his previous proposal, to exclude the Irish entirely, equally criticised. Balfour argued that the new scheme had the potential for making government unworkable, for a future British government might have a majority in imperial questions, while being unable to legislate for Britain alone (66).

In the speeches Balfour made against the Bill, both inside and outside the Commons, this was one of the few practical proposals that he dwelt on. In general, he concentrated on the Bill as an entity and the evils that would result from its implementation (67). For the first time in his dealings with Irish questions, he brought up the problem of Ulster. Speaking again in Midlothian during the 1892 campaign, he described the attitude of the northern Protestants as a "gigantic difficulty" for Gladstone (68).

In April the following year, while the second reading was being debated, he had the chance to develop this point. Salisbury was unable through ill-health to fulfil an engagement in Belfast, and Balfour took his place. From a platform in Donegall Square he watched a march past by 20,000 Orangemen and others, accompanied by 50 bands. The processions took 4 hours, after which a copy of the Bill was burnt in the centre of the square. Balfour received an ecstatic

welcome, as did delegations from Scottish Unionism and a Scottish pipe band: "the cheering was so great that it was impossible to hear a sound of the pipes" (69). A friend from Co. Monaghan wrote afterwards to Balfour's sister, obviously completely overcome by the proceedings:

> So long as I live I shall never get over seeing that pathetic giant the Ulster people stretching out its hands, brown, strong, toilworn and sorely tried, towards your brother (70).

In the evening Balfour addressed a meeting in the Ulster Hall. For the first time he made a tacit admission that physical resistance to the Bill might be justified; a point to be taken up later by Bonar Law at the time of the third Home Rule Bill.

> I shall go back to my work in the House of Commons strengthened by the conviction I have obtained to-day of what Ulster is, and what Ulster means. And depend upon it, that if the British people can only have that brought home to their minds, not all the forces arrayed against you can prevail against righteousness and justice in the end.... I would venture ... to appeal to you to recollect that you do not stand alone, that you have not been abandoned by Great Britain, and that the Home Rule Bill has not yet become law. I do not come here to preach any doctrine of passive obedience or non-resistance. You have had to fight for your liberties before. I pray God you may never have to fight for them again.

If it was permissible to resist a tyrannous King, it must sometimes be permissible to resist "a tyrannical majority. I hope and believe that this is but the utterance of a mere abstract proposition" (71).

Speaking in London a fortnight later, Balfour again dwelt on Ulster in making the imperial argument against Home Rule.

> They are animated, as you are animated, by something much more lasting, much more worthy than mere personal

> considerations. They feel themselves as you feel yourselves to be, citizens of a great Empire and they know as well as you know that the Empire will not, in all its chequered history, have received a blow so deadly from its worst enemies as it is now intended to be dealt it by those who profess themselves to be its best friends (72).

When he went to deliver his message of opposition to the Bill in Dublin, he told his audience that ultimately he had confidence that the people of Ulster could look after themselves. He could have no such confidence of the fate that would befall loyal Unionists in the south of Ireland if Home Rule were to pass. He worried in particular about 3 groups: the landlords, civil servants, and the much-maligned police, to whom he paid tribute:

> I saw a great deal of that force when I was Irish Secretary, and I know that a more splendid, a more faithful, and a more loyal body of men does not serve the Queen in or out of Ireland (73).

For on several occasions he insisted that some thought must be given to the character of the men who would run a Home Rule Ireland. They were

> men who have deliberately and of malice aforethought employed crime and criminal methods for the furtherance of political ends.

Now, because they made a few "smooth speeches" Gladstone

> Inebriated by the constant reflections upon his own pet scheme, and oblivious of history, oblivious of even the recent past, blinding himself and endeavouring to blind his followers to facts that were within their ken and came within their own observation, has the prophetic courage to tell us ... that the authors of the Plan of Campaign, and boycotting, and other ingenious political devices are, of all men, the most fitted to make Ireland henceforth a peaceable, orderly, prosperous, and wealthy country (74).

In his speeches against the Bill he also propounded his argument that the Irish had no tradition of government or independence and no institutions of value that had not been imported from Britain. He insisted that his recipe for Ireland was the correct one. To continue to suppress crime and to settle the land question would bring most Irishmen to a state of contentment in time. As for those who would continue to demand Home Rule they were just disloyal and unappeasable, and only sought Home Rule as a jumping off point for complete independence.

Having been passed in the Commons, the Bill was swiftly and unceremoniously rejected by the Lords. Safe in the knowledge that the Lords would throw it out, and having done his best, Balfour relapsed into his habitual cool cynicism. In September 1893 he wrote to his mistress:

> The third reading debate was not I think particularly interesting; nor were any of the speeches particularly good: decent and adequate, but no more. I wound up for the Unionists, and can now look on with cynical indifference at the ponderous efforts of the House of Lords to pose as a debating assembly.... London swarms with obscure peers and still more obscure peeresses.

He described a visit to the Lords to listen to the debate when Lord Londonderry lost his temper because he was given too little time to finish his speech; earlier in the day "Devonshire had made an enormous (and between ourselves most tedious though able) speech against the Bill" (75).

The Liberals decided to soldier on in office after the defeat of the Bill, rather than dissolve. Gladstone retired and the government limped on under the joint and explosive

care of Rosebery and Harcourt until 1895. The election of that year returned the Unionists, as did the next one, of 1900. Balfour took little part in the detailed governing of Ireland during these administrations, putting it in the hands of his brother Gerald and then of George Wyndham. The local government act was passed, land purchase was successfully extended and some thought, though as we have seen, no action, was given to the perennial problem of Irish university education.

The Liberals returned triumphant in 1905. Balfour took up opposition, though not with the relish of 1893. Governing had become a habit for him, a way of life, and he did not care for the new House of Commons with its host of new Liberal and Labour members. Nonetheless he continued to condemn any form of Home Rule or anything that might lead towards it. He took the trouble, as he always had, to speak in nearly all the debates on Scottish Home Rule and to ridicule the idea. He opposed the ill-fated 1907 Irish devolution proposal; an opposition that one Scottish periodical described as "the fallacy of 'the thin end of the wedge' in its most extreme form" (76). And, of course, he opposed the third Home Rule Bill when it was introduced, having previously attacked the Parliament Act as a mere device to facilitate Home Rule.

From 1910 to 1914 he again poured forth his arguments against Home Rule, even after he had lost the leadership of his party, in speeches and pamphlets. The arguments were the

same ones he had used in 1893 and before, brought up to date where necessary (77).

Balfour acquiesced peaceably enough in the decisions that were made on the future of Ireland between 1919 and 1923, though ultimately they were decisions against everything that he had stood for. He continued to believe, however, that he had read Ireland aright and that his policy of the years 1887-1891 had been the correct one. A few weeks before his death, recognising that he would probably not live to finish his Autobiography, he had insisted to Lord Midleton, the former leader of the southern Irish Unionists, that a full explanation of the successes of his Irish years should be published (78).

In fact, the evidence was against him. For nearly 20 years the Unionists had followed his line and had tried to suppress crime and to kill Home Rule with kindness. Events proved that the demand for Home Rule was indeed a genuine nationalist demand, and that "light railways and heavy punishments" were not enough. Though Balfour's policy had had its successes, it ultimately failed for this reason. With his dislike and contempt for the Irish, Balfour could never see the limitations of his approach to Irish government, nor could he ever concede that it would be anything less than criminal to break up the Empire at its heart to try and satisfy a rebellious Celtic people.

His view of the Irish problem had served him well enough at the time however. His Party was delighted to be told that

the spectre of Home Rule would vanish with the firm application of the Crimes Act and the granting of some concessions. They were further encouraged to believe that his Irish policy was sound by the fury it aroused amongst the Irish nationalist leaders. They accepted his assurances with enthusiasm, they made him a hero, and then they made him their leader. From 1887 to 1893 he could do little wrong in their eyes. Much as he may have despised Ireland, it made him the leading Unionist of his day. From then on until 1911, though respected he never held the enthusiasm of his party in the same way, perhaps because he did not find another cause that moved him as much as the pacification of Ireland. His resignation in November 1911 was greeted with general relief. Despite his position there, there was little sorrow in Scotland at his departure either, partly because his place was taken by another Scot: Andrew Bonar Law.

CHAPTER 7: UNIONISM: BONAR LAW AND BUCHAN

> My feeling was that of the current parody of the Prayer Book: 'Lord have mercy upon us and incline our hearts to Bonar Law'.
>
> John Buchan on Bonar Law's succession to the Conservative leadership in 1911

When Balfour did eventually retire from the leadership of the Conservative party in the autumn of 1911 2 contenders for his job emerged, as the party had been divided over the desirability or otherwise of tariff reform since 1903. They were Austen Chamberlain, son and ardent disciple of the initiator of the idea of tariff reform, and Walter Long, spokesman for free trade. Since neither side was prepared to accept the other's candidate, they eventually compromised on a third and late entry into the leadership race: Andrew Bonar Law. Their choice somewhat surprised and unnerved them. Bonar Law was a very different sort of politician to Balfour, to whom they had all become so accustomed. Though respected inside the party as a sound second-rank spokesman, his qualities of leadership, if any, were unknown, and he was hardly a household name in the country.

In fact, they had stumbled upon an ideal leader. For the question that was to absorb politics for the next 3 years was one to which Bonar Law brought a ruthless determination built on deep personal conviction: Home Rule. From the point of view of this study what makes Bonar Law so fascinating and so important was his almost perfect illustration of the links still connecting Scotland and Protestant Ulster.

His ancestors had emigrated to Ulster from Scotland in the late seventeenth century. His father, James Law, came from Coleraine. Educated at Glasgow University, he entered the ministry of the Free Church of Scotland. He served for a short time at home in Coleraine before taking up the charge of 2 parishes in New Brunswick in Canada, where Andrew was born in 1858. His mother came from Glasgow and, after her death and his father's re-marriage, her family, the Kidstons, took on Andrew. At the age of 12 he went to live with them in Glasgow, and was sent to Glasgow High School.

The Kidstons were a prosperous family with an established place in Glasgow society. In 1874, when he was 16, Andrew left school and joined their family banking firm as a clerk. Three years later his father was forced through ill-health to abandon his strenuous ministry in semi-frontier New Brunswick and returned to live in Coleraine. During the next 5 years, until his father's death in 1882, Bonar Law spent nearly every weekend with him in Ulster. He was deeply attached to his father, from whom perhaps he inherited his purposeful but dour and melancholic approach to life. Through these visits he developed a lasting affection for Ulster.

In 1885 Bonar Law left banking to become a partner in a firm of Glasgow Iron merchants. Over the next 15 years he worked assiduously and successfully at dealing in iron. He made money and established himself as a substantial figure in Glasgow's commercial world. By the mid-1890s he was

wealthy enough to consider indulging his interest in politics. With his Canadian background, his enthusiasm for Ulster and his knowledge of Glasgow's commercial base, he was a firm believer in Empire and a natural Unionist.

He was adopted as Conservative candidate for Glasgow Blackfriars and Hutchesontown for the Khaki Election of 1900. The seat had been Liberal since 1885, but with a big swing against the Liberals in Scotland in this election, he won it by a thousand votes. With his financial background, he took an interest in economic questions in the House and, when Balfour became Prime Minister in 1902, Bonar Law was appointed to the junior ministry at the Board of Trade, under Balfour's brother Gerald. He seems to have become quickly established in the party as a spokesman on financial matters.

Inside the party, Bonar Law reserved his strongest personal loyalty not for Balfour but for Joseph Chamberlain. Perhaps he felt he had more in common with the manufacturer from Birmingham than with many of the Tory squires; certainly he embraced Chamberlain's campaign for tariff reform and imperial preference with enthusiasm. During the years 1903 to 1906 he devoted much time and energy to promoting Chamberlain's revolutionary scheme. Indeed he was later to tell Austen Chamberlain that in the period 1900 to 1914 the only 2 things he "cared intensely about" were tariff reform and Ulster (1).

Occupying a seat not normally held by a Tory, Bonar Law was obviously in a precarious position in the 1906 general election. He did indeed lose his seat: to G. N. Barnes from Labour. He was, however, by then of sufficient standing in the party to be found another constituency. The Tory elected for Dulwich agreed to take the Chiltern Hundreds, and Bonar Law was returned at a by-election.

By 1911, therefore, he was established as a leader of Conservatism. His mastery of figures and easy comprehension of complex financial bills were respected, and he was held to be a sound, if not dramatic, speaker. He was, however, at the head of the second rank, rather than in the forefront of the party. It seems most unlikely that he would have ever made it to the leadership had it not been for the deadlock over Chamberlain and Long. Though closely identified with tariff reform, he was acceptable as a compromise candidate. To the free traders, anyone was preferable to a Chamberlain; while the tariff reformers, if they could not have their ideal choice, had at least got a convert to their cause. In fact, of course, tariff reform was not a question of any great importance during the next 3 years. Bonar Law was never to deliver any major pronouncement on the subject before the outbreak of the world war: like Balfour before him, he skated round the subject when it did come up (2).

What did matter, as was clear to Tories by the autumn of 1911, was Home Rule and Ireland. With the Parliament Act safely on the statute book, Asquith had made known his

intention to honour his promise to the Irish nationalists and introduce a Home Rule Bill in the spring of the following year. Not that Bonar Law was chosen for his Ulster connections. Indeed, Ireland not having been in the forefront of political controversy during the previous 10 years, he had never made a major policy declaration on Ireland. Some Tories were unsure of precisely how determined he would prove to be in leading the opposition to Home Rule. If nothing else, they knew they could always rely on Balfour to fight at his hardest on this subject. They had no way of having any such certainty about their unusual new leader.

They had no cause to worry. As an imperialist and a good Tory he loathed the idea of Home Rule. Like Balfour, he considered it unnecessary and regressive: backward-looking and in conflict with the spirit of the times. But in addition, and unlike Balfour, he felt deeply about Ulster and its Protestant population. Like many Scots, he had, as we have seen, close personal associations with Ulster. Fundamentally, he approached the whole Irish question through the problem of Ulster. In this, he was closer to the Scottish Unionist perception of what the Home Rule controversy was about than Balfour had ever been. Balfour was always determined to destroy the whole concept of Home Rule and for him, as for so many senior Unionists, the Ulstermen were a vital tool, a means, to that end. Bonar Law disliked the whole idea of Home Rule too, but he genuinely understood and sympathised with, perhaps even

shared, the Ulster Protestants' fear of, and aversion to, rule by a Dublin parliament. As we shall see, ultimately he would have been prepared to forego his imperial convictions and countenance some form of Home Rule, if Protestant Ulster had been completely excluded.

In this sense some senior Tories, especially the Marquess of Lansdowne, a southern Irish landowner, did have some cause to worry about Bonar Law's approach to the Home Rule battle. In fact, however, no offer to exclude Ulster totally was ever formally made before the outbreak of war in 1914. The potential problem remained in the background, and in the meantime the Unionists had found themselves a leader both pugnacious and ruthless.

Bonar Law came to the leadership as something of an outsider. He was the first Tory leader ever to have emerged from the commercial middle-class of a city. He was in marked contrast to Balfour: no-one could ever accuse him of insincerity or dilettanteism, no-one could criticise him for approaching a problem with an epigram or a light and subtle wit. He was dour and determined and both resourceful and merciless in the pursuit of his objects. Unlike Asquith or F. E. Smith, he was not anxious to assimilate into upper-class life, but nor did he resent it. He gladly allowed the Marchioness of Londonderry, a prominent Tory hostess, to take over the entertaining she insisted that, as leader, he should indulge in. But, genuinely bored by political social life, he remained an outsider even at the parties

given in his own name. He was certainly not intimidated by Balfour and his kind, nor did he seem to resent Balfour's evident determination to remain amidst the top councils of the party. He treated Balfour with polite interest and respect, and was not offended by his tendency to try and patronise him (3).

He did, however, try to discourage the high degree of social intercourse between the parties. As the battle over Home Rule became increasingly bitter, he endeavoured to stop his senior colleagues mixing socially with the Liberals. The English upper class habit of meeting with their opponents in the evenings, implying, he felt, that political differences were in some nature a game, he found both incomprehensible and shocking (4). For Bonar Law the battle was always in earnest. From the first he assailed Asquith with a ferocity that amazed as much as it delighted his colleagues.

Despite being something of an outsider, and the change of emphasis in leadership, Bonar Law always worked carefully with his colleagues and through the established channels. He never developed a network of disciples or information gatherers to help him, as Rosebery, for example, had done. The only exception to this was Max Aitken, later Lord Beaverbrook, his close friend and fellow-Canadian who had helped him to gain the leadership. An examination of Bonar Law's papers reveals that for information on the state of the party and opinion in the country he relied mainly on Arthur Steel-Maitland, the party Chairman (5).

Even with Scotland, the position was the same. One of the first letters of congratulation he received after election to the leadership was from John Stroyan, a friend from Perthshire. Stroyan said that he was delighted to see the Unionists ceasing to celebrate the hereditary principle and moving into the modern world (6). Law's letters over the next few years included a number from other old friends, mostly Glasgow businessmen. They gave him their views on Ulster, tariff reform, women's suffrage and the iniquities of organised labour. To them all he replied politely but distantly: there was obviously no question of his seeking their advice on Scottish opinion, their contributions were spontaneous and unsolicited and he treated them as such (7).

The channels he did use for gauging Scottish opinion were all well-established ones. First there was the Marquis of Tullibardine, M.P. for Perthshire West and heir of the Duke of Atholl. In February 1912, for example, Tullibardine writes "just a few lines to tell you how things are going on up here in the North, as I am sure you would like to know directly from someone who watches the progress of events". He regrets that "I cannot say that there is much feeling against Irish Home Rule in the meantime", but at least he can "trace no real movement in favour of Scottish Home Rule" (8). At later dates, Tullibardine reports on a coal strike in Lanarkshire and, at great length, on "the safe popular line to take" if there is class feeling raised against the Tories about the Highland Clearances. He should stress:

> The Liberal Duke of Sutherland at the time was responsible for the worst of it, and Breadalbane, another Liberal, was also responsible. These were the two great and most brutal clearances (9).

The second person Bonar Law corresponded regularly with was J. P. Croal, the editor of The Scotsman. Croal had succeeded Charles Cooper as editor in 1906, and was to hold the position until 1924. An irascible man, a terror to his staff, his main interest in the years before the First World War was in using The Scotsman to promote the unity of the various Scottish Presbyterian churches (10). Politically, he was a great supporter of Bonar Law, with whom he seems to have become quite friendly. He was one of the first to write congratulating Law on his election as party leader:

> It is gratifying to me - a slight piece of vanity no doubt but permissible - to find my appreciation of your work in the Parliament of 1906 so splendidly justified. I dare say you know that 'The Scotsman' while fully understanding the conditions of loyal and united action required for successful party government maintains an independent outlook of its own. But I am sure we shall be able to support your leadership quite as consistently as we did Mr. Balfour's (11).

The "independent outlook" was hardly evident: the erstwhile Liberal paper had become almost totally Unionist by this time; as its editor said, it had "consistently" supported Balfour. Croal was a firm tariff reformer, part of the reason, no doubt, for his "appreciation" of Bonar Law. In December 1912 he wrote to Law urging him to avoid timidity and declare firmly for tariff reform, even though such a declaration might prove unpopular in the short term (12). On Ireland too, Croal and his paper supported Bonar Law: Croal wrote to him at length in October 1913 offering

encouragement over Ulster. But, he confessed, personally he had always had his doubts about Redmond's sincerity:

> But this assumes that he (i.e. Redmond) wants Home Rule. About that I have always been sceptical. He is a big figure just now. He has a large salary from the Nationalist fund; in Dublin he would be eclipsed by Devlin and very soon driven into retirement. If this belief is right a continued feud on Home Rule will suit his purpose (13).

Croal was not the only Unionist expressing this somewhat cynical, and inaccurate, view of Redmond's position, but it did not argue highly for the political perception of the editor of a major newspaper.

Bonar Law's third, and main, source of Scottish political information was, reasonably enough, the Scottish Tory Whip, Sir George Younger. Younger had run his family brewing firm since 1868, and been convener of Clackmannan County Council from 1895 to 1906. Three times unsuccessful Unionist candidate for Clackmannan and Kinross, he had finally been elected to parliament in 1906 for Ayr. He wrote frequently to Law, sending him detailed intelligence on party warfare in many Scottish constituencies. Unlike Croal, he was anxious that his leader should avoid any commitment on tariff reform: any decision to tax food, he argued, would mean the end of Unionist hopes in 15 winnable Liberal seats (14).

In a letter of 1912 Younger wrote that he could not sense much opposition to Irish Home Rule in Scotland, but by the middle of the next year he was much more cheerful. Carson had had very successful meetings in Perth and Dundee, the

latter in Churchill's constituency and attended by Churchill's constituency President and Chairman. Younger was sure that the engagements had had a very good effect in Scotland, though Carson had pulled out of 2 further meetings, in Aberdeen and Inverness, at the last minute. As he wrote to Law, having eventually secured Balfour for the Aberdeen meeting.

> The work up here is always difficult, and thankless, and one feels very acutely any disappointment of this kind. We might as well shut up shop if our friends are not going to play the game (15).

Bonar Law obviously appreciated Younger's work at the "thankless" task of organising Scottish Unionism, for he secured him the party chairmanship in succession to Steel Maitland in 1917.

Bonar Law delivered his first major speech as party leader in London on 26th January 1912. As befitted such an occasion, he spoke at length, dealing with many aspects of government policy. He attacked Lloyd George's approach to economics, despaired of Haldane's efforts at army reform, and was unenthusiastic about Grey's handling of foreign affairs. The longest section of the speech, of course, was devoted to Ireland, as Asquith had made known his intention of introducing a Home Rule Bill in the spring. He ran through all the by then standard objections to Home Rule, and deplored the spectacle of the government of the Empire being at the behest of the disloyal Irish party: "Since it was not possible to get the Nationalists in their pocket, they have put themselves in the pockets of the Nationalists".

The main thrust of his attack, however, was the wrong that Home Rule proposed to do to Ulster. Though the Unionist party would always consider any reasonable demand of the majority in Ireland, they "must refuse" any demand that would so adversely affect the minority. He suggested to his audience that they tried to imagine an Ireland three-quarters Protestant and one-quarter Catholic, the latter concentrated around Dublin. If these Catholics feared the rest of the population and looked to the Imperial Parliament to safeguard their rights, what would be the reaction of the Radicals? They would, rightly, accept the charge of protecting the minority: in the real case now coming before them, the Unionists would do the same (16).

In this first speech Bonar Law set out the fundamental base of his fight against Home Rule, and he was not to waver from it. The Ulster Protestants were a laudable people, and a loyal people. Not only did they oppose the idea of Home Rule, they looked to the Unionist party to support their opposition to it. This they had the right to expect, it was a sacred duty to the Unionists, and he had every intention of upholding this duty.

His next move in the battle was made in April. Two days before the introduction of the Bill by Asquith, he attended a mammoth demonstration in Belfast. Close on 100,000 men marched past Bonar Law and Carson, and another 100,000 turned out to hear the new Unionist leader. Carson spoke briefly, introducing Bonar Law, who was received with great

enthusiasm. He told his audience that he came to assure them of his support, and that they were a great inspiration to the cause of Unionism. He paid tribute to Balfour and all he had done for Ireland: thanks to him and to the sound sense of Unionist rule, no country in Europe had progressed as much as Ireland in the previous 20 years. The whole impetus of modern progress was towards "closer union":

> Our policy is to enable the national spirit of Ireland to receive, as the national spirit of Scotland has received, its highest development in a policy of friendship, of union and prosperity.

He ended his speech with an emotional passage, a passage which showed how close he was personally, in historical imagination and in rhetoric, to his Ulster heritage.

> You must trust to yourselves. Once again you hold the pass for the Empire. You are a besieged city. Does not the picture of the past, with which you are so familiar, rise again before your eyes? The timid have left you. Your Lundys have betrayed you, but you have closed your gates. The Government by their Parliament Act have erected a boom against you, a boom to cut you off from the help of the British people. You will burst that boom. The help will come, and when the crisis is over men will say of you in words not unlike those once used by Pitt, 'You have saved yourselves by your exertions, and you will save the Empire by your example' (17).

Six days later he denounced the Home Rule Bill for the first time in the Commons. He poured scorn on the notion of it being a final settlement: the 2 communities in Ireland would soon quarrel in a Dublin parliament and bring their quarrels to Westminster. Thus, if anything a parliament in Ireland would increase and not diminish the congestion of the Imperial Parliament, as the arguments in Dublin were carried on in London where they would have to be finally settled.

Working on his financial experience, he discussed the economic provisions of the Bill at length, concluding that they would be disastrous.

He described his trip to Belfast and his reception there with relish.

> It really was not like a political demonstration. It was the expression of the soul of a people - as I believe, a great people.

He concluded with a savage attack on Asquith for opportunism and lack of conviction. If, he argued, one looked at the 3 occasions when Home Rule had been proposed, each time it was when the Liberals were dependent on the Irish party for a parliamentary majority. Between 1895 and 1910 Asquith had never referred to Home Rule and he had certainly not been anxious to bring it forward before 1910, when the Liberals had a large independent majority. For all the talk of nations and destiny, the introduction of the Bill was simply paying the price required to hang on to power, something Asquith would go to nearly any lengths to do (18).

During this speech, Law had discussed the relevance of religion to the problem, and his attitude in this question is worth considering. He was frequently accused of personal anti-Catholic religious bigotry, a charge he was very sensitive to. He declared firmly:

> I have never spoken on this subject (i.e. the religious differences between the two Irish communities), and I dislike to speak about it, for, whatever my views in other respects are, I am certainly not bigoted in religion.

He went on, however, to point out that the Bill offered no

guarantees of religious freedom to the minority. He implicitly believed Redmond when he claimed that he had no desire to persecute Ireland's Protestants; but could Redmond really speak for all Irish Catholics on a matter like this? The Ulster Protestants passionately held to their belief that there was a real danger of persecution, and the Government and the Bill could offer them no reassurance.

In the autumn of 1912 he had an interesting correspondence on this question with Ismay, Lady Crichton-Stuart. She was a southern Irish Catholic Unionist, married to the second son of the famous Tory Scottish nationalist Marquess of Bute. Her husband was Conservative M.P. for Cardiff, which seat he had won in the December 1910 general election. She wrote that she was proud to be a Unionist, and proud to be a Catholic. Like many Unionists from the other 3 provinces of Ireland, she was unhappy at the concentration on Ulster. But while she could understand that, what she could never accept was the encouragement of anti-Catholic sentiment in Ulster which was "unworthy and deeply offensive".

> But <u>most surely</u> the moderate Unionists, and the Ulster fanatics have now come to the parting of the ways! And why? Because for some altogether unexplained reason, the Unionist Party have allowed religion to be dragged into party politics.

Bonar Law replied to her letter at length. He opened his reply by refuting any suggestion that he had fanned the religious question himself:

> I have read your letter with the greatest interest, and I think I can sincerely say that there is no one who likes less to arouse religious bigotry than I do, and I do not think that I have said a word in any of

> my speeches which would be open to the charge that I attacked your religion.

He defended the concentration on Ulster:

> The real reason why in my opinion the Ulster point of view must be kept to the front is that, whether the cause be religious or not (and I do not think it matters), the population there is homogeneous and determined to be treated in the same way as the citizens of the U.K. In my opinion from every point of view they have the right to take that attitude (19).

An examination of Bonar Law's speeches and letters reveal that his assertion to Lady Crichton-Stuart was a truthful one. He never attacked Catholicism or appealed directly to anti-Catholic sentiment. Indeed, privately, he worked, on at least one occasion to discourage it, writing to William Moore, M.P. for Armagh North:

> I should however like to suggest that so far as you find it possible, it would be as well to dwell on the differences between loyalists and separatists rather than those between Protestants and Catholics (20).

Where Bonar Law was guilty was in never publicly criticising or disassociating himself from the more extreme forms of Ulster bigotry that emerged. He might mention the fears of the Protestants without actually indulging in "Home Rule is Rome Rule" rhetoric; but others did not.

The fact that he was so closely involved with Ulster's cause, and was seen to be so, also encouraged the belief that he was a bigot. If he always made a point of expressing complete solidarity with Ulster, he could not complain if people associated him with all of Ulster's opinions. Another reason why Law was so identified with the Ulster position was his attitude to Carson.

One of the first letters he wrote on becoming Conservative leader was to Carson, in which he said: "I wish in this Home Rule business to do nothing except in co-operation with you" (21). The 2 men became good friends, and developed a considerable mutual respect. Carson wrote to Lady Londonderry in 1913 "I see B. L. almost daily and of course have great confidence in his judgement" and, on another occasion to the same correspondent: "it is a great thing that he is animated only by his love of the country and is not 'on the make'" (22). We have seen above the regard that Carson had for Balfour: his relationship with Bonar Law was rather different. Whereas he had always looked to Balfour as his chief, with Bonar Law he was on terms of equality. Not only did Law consult Carson before each step he took in the campaign against Home Rule, he always referred to himself as only the leader of British Unionism, with Carson alone being the leader of Ulster Unionism. For the first time the Ulster Unionists were not just an interest inside Unionism, but a separate entity. This situation was created by Bonar Law, through his admiration for Carson and his continual stressing of the importance of Ulster. In a sense, he became not Carson's leader, but one of his faithful disciples. To paraphrase his jibe at the government: he had not tried to keep the Ulster Unionists in his pocket, but had happily climbed into theirs.

On July 27 1912 Bonar Law delivered what was to become his most famous speech on Home Rule, indeed the most remembered speech of the whole controversy. A huge demonstration at

Blenheim Palace, the home of the Duke of Marlborough, was addressed by Carson, F. E. Smith and Law. In a remarkable and celebrated passage Bonar Law told the meeting:

> We regard the government as a revolutionary committee which has seized upon despotic power by fraud. In our opposition to them we shall not be guided by the considerations or bound by the restraints which would influence us in an ordinary constitutional struggle. We shall take the means, whatever means seem to us the most effective, to deprive them of the despotic power which they have usurped and compel them to appeal to the people whom they have deceived. They may, perhaps they will, carry their Home Rule Bill through the House of Commons but what then? I said the other day in the House of Commons and I repeat here that there are things stronger than parliamentary majorities.... Before I occupied the position which I now fill in the party I said that, in my belief, if an attempt were made to deprive these men of their birthright - as part of a corrupt parliamentary bargain - they would be justified in resisting such an attempt by all means in their power, including force. I said it then, and I repeat now with a full sense of responsibility which attaches to my position, that, in my opinion, if such an attempt is made, I can imagine no length of resistance to which Ulster can go in which I should not be prepared to support them, and in which, in my belief, they would not be supported by the overwhelming majority of the British people (23).

Asquith described this speech as a "reckless rodomontade", but it was clear that he was genuinely shocked by it, as he had every right to be (24). At no other time in this century has a major party leader dared to appeal directly to violence to circumvent democracy. Such a declaration would have been remarkable if it had been made by Carson or by Redmond: from the leader of the Tory party it was sensational. What Bonar Law had said was not far short of treason, and it was bound to be shocking not only to the Liberals, but to many Conservatives as well. To justify it a rationale was worked out.

This rationale opened on the premiss, outlined above, that Home Rule was not a matter of conviction for the Government, but the result of a "corrupt parliamentary bargain". By this bargain the Liberals had secured the passage of the Parliament Act, thanks to the use of Irish votes. Home Rule was the corollary: the price to be paid for the Parliament Act, and for staying in power. The 2 elections of 1910 had both been fought on the issue of the Lords' veto. Home Rule had always been implicit in the passing of the Parliament Act, but had never, the Unionists argued, been explicitly put before the electorate. The government could not claim to have a direct mandate from the country for Home Rule, and it was surely unthinkable to advance such a major constitutional change without one. Asquith had a duty to dissolve and seek the people's view on Home Rule (25). If he did so and secured the verdict he wanted then, said Bonar Law, while he would continue to oppose Home Rule in Parliament, and while he could not answer for the reaction of the Ulster Protestants, he would not encourage or materially assist violent opposition.

Such an offer could hardly have looked particularly inviting to Asquith. In any event, as the Prime Minister well knew, the Unionist position did not have much to recommend it constitutionally. By long usage a government's right to govern as it saw fit came from a general election and lasted while it could command a parliamentary majority. Oppositions were often to complain of the lack of a mandate for a specific far-reaching measure, but such complaints were an

accepted part of parliamentary debate rather than an excuse for rebellion.

Asquith remained, not surprisingly, unimpressed by Law's arguments for him to resign. Having established his threat of civil war, the opposition leader then turned to explore the only remaining constitutionalchannel: the monarch. He and the other Unionist leaders took comfort from the fact that in 1910 King George had only promised a massive creation of peers if Asquith first held another election. This, of course, Asquith had done in December 1910; he had won the election, the Lords had agreed reluctantly to pass the Parliament Act and the King's willingness to create new peers on a huge scale had not been invoked. The point for the Unionists was the King's request for the second election: they hoped to persuade him to ask Asquith to call another election on the Home Rule issue. The unfortunate King, having weathered one constitutional crisis in 1910, now found himself, from the middle of 1912, being badgered by Bonar Law to step into politics again. He duly spoke to Asquith, who told him that he had no intention of resigning, and that he should remember that his duty as a constitutional monarch was to follow the advice of his elected ministers.

By the following year, Bonar Law's approaches to the King had reached a new and alarming level. He was now telling the King that he had the right, and the duty, to dismiss Asquith. He should then appoint a caretaker government, perhaps under Balfour or even Rosebery, to organise an

election. In this Law had the backing of the eminent constitutional authority Professor Dicey, who should have known better (26). The King, now understandably very perturbed and genuinely horrified at the prospect of violence in Ireland, finally suggested that it might help if the 2 leaders met privately to discuss the whole question. This idea was adopted, rather half-heartedly on both sides, and during the autumn of 1913 Asquith and Bonar Law met secretly on 3 occasions.

The discussions focused on Ulster. After their first meeting Asquith publicly made reference to the possibility of some compromise over Ulster, in a speech in his constituency. Bonar Law's public reply to this overture was made at a meeting in Newcastle on Tyne. He invited Carson to speak with him to demonstrate that there could be no question of his abandoning the Ulster Protestants, "that it might be perfectly clear that the pledge which I made at Blenheim still holds good". He re-iterated that he still believed that the only hope of a real settlement lay in Asquith calling an election. He was, he told his audience, unsure of what exactly Asquith wished to discuss: "He succeeded to a degree, which even Mr. Gladstone at his best could not surpass, in obscuring his meaning". Nonetheless, he maintained, "we shall carefully consider any proposals he may make to us and consider them with a real desire to find a solution, if a solution be possible" (27).

The meetings between the 2 came to nothing. Discussing the problem privately, however, they seem to have found that

they were closer to each other's positions than they had expected. They were certainly closer than their respective supporters would have liked, and closer than they were subsequently to admit. It emerged that Asquith was prepared to allow some form of exclusion for Ulster. Bonar Law would have accepted complete exclusion of 6 Ulster counties from any of the Bill until such time as a majority within those counties voted to join the rest of Ireland. Asquith could offer "Home Rule within Home Rule": some form of devolution for Ulster inside the structure of Home Rule, and answerable to a Dublin parliament. These 2 versions of what constituted "exclusion" were so different that the discussions were abandoned.

The fact that they were, however, even discussing the same concept was remarkable. And their positions in regard to their allies were rather different. Personally, it seems reasonable to believe that Asquith would have offered more than he did: his interest was in getting the question finally settled and carrying on with government. Though there was obviously a point beyond which he would not allow himself to be pushed, his approach was essentially pragmatic, and he was limited, not by his own views, or that of his party, but by those of his Irish nationalist allies.

Bonar Law, however, was expressing the demand that he and Carson would, ultimately, have found acceptable. But he too had supporters behind him, supporters who were unhappy at the idea of the exclusion of Ulster being the basis for

a settlement. Principally, this line was taken by Lansdowne and by Balfour (28). They extracted an assurance from Law that the possible exclusion of Ulster would not be used as the accepted basis for any further discussions that might be held with the Government. If the 2 sides were to meet, then they must meet without a prior agenda at all, and discuss the whole question. After a brisk exchange of letters, Law wrote to Lansdowne:

> Probably I have looked upon the solution of leaving Ulster out much more favourably than you have, for I have had the idea for many years that that might perhaps in the end be a right method of dealing with the situation. But I quite agree with you that such a solution is only a last resort and nothing would be more foolish than to give the enemy the idea that we were not only ready but anxious for a settlement on these lines (29).

Speaking in Bristol in January 1914, Bonar Law announced formally from his side that his conversations with Asquith had come to nothing. Again he insisted that the Ulster people would never be deserted, and again demanded a general election. He told his audience that he now took a very serious view of the prospects for the ensuing year:

> In my belief we are drifting rapidly, and, if nothing be done to change the current, we are drifting inevitably to civil war.... Never in history, I think, have political parties in this country faced each other in a conflict more serious.

The responsibility rested entirely with the Government, who "are ready, apparently, to face civil war rather than face the people" (30).

This talk of violence and civil war brought Bonar Law round to thinking of the army. If the Government were really to

impose Home Rule on Ulster, they would need the army to do it for them. The scheme to prevent the use of the army seems to have come from Bonar Law himself. By long usage, the army was formally re-created every year, by the Annual Army Act. Law proposed that an amendment should be added to the Act in the Lords, forbidding the use of the army in Ulster. The Government would then be forced to choose between 2 impossible alternatives. Either they would have to accept the amendment, which would be a humiliation which would surely stop all progress with the Home Rule Bill. Alternatively, if they rejected the amendment, they would need to invoke the Parliament Act to over-ride the Lords. During the 2 years that would take, the army would in effect cease to exist. Surely, Law argued, Asquith would be unable to accommodate either of these alternatives, and the long looked-for general election would at last be called.

Again Law was cleearly proposing to tamper with the Constitution: he would be using an old safeguard against the use of despotic power by the monarch, the annual re-creation of the army, to incapacitate a democratically elected government. Some senior Tories, especially Lansdowne, were very anxious at the prospect, but agreed to Law's further exploration of the subject. Law realised that there would be an element of risk involved, and so thought it important to ensure that the stratagem would be effective. He was particularly worried that Asquith might be able to evade the problem by keeping the army in existence without conditions by the use of the Royal Prerogative.

He sought an opinion on this subject from the party's leading lawyer: R. B., now Sir Robert, Finlay.

Finlay wrote a lengthy memorandum for Bonar Law on the proposal (31). He concluded that there was no possible way that the Government could get round the amendment to the Act if it were to be made. He confined himself to this judgement and made no comment on the advisability or otherwise of the step: with his long-held support for firm rule in Ireland and dislike of Home Rule, it is reasonable to suppose that he approved of Bonar Law's idea. In fact, the idea was never put into practice: the celebrated events known as the Curragh Mutiny seeming to render it unnecessary. After the mutiny it appeared to Bonar Law that it might well not be necessary to put a limit on the army's use in Ireland, the chances being high that much of the army would refuse to operate against the Ulster Unionists, and the chances being higher that the Government would not dare find out if this was so.

Bonar Law himself had had no part in the main events of the Curragh Mutiny, but he was quick to offer assistance to Gough and the other mutineers as the story emerged. And while he had never directly exhorted the army to disobey any orders they might receive regarding Ulster, he had frequently referred to the possibility of their doing so in, to say the least, ambiguous terms:

> King James had behind him the letter of the law just as Mr. Asquith has now.... In order to carry out his despotic intention the King had the largest army that had ever been seen in England. What happened? There

> was no civil war. There was a revolution and the King disappeared. Why? Because his own army refused to fight for him (32).

After the breakdown of the talks between Asquith and Bonar Law, the Prime Minister put his own idea for a compromise forward. Addressing the Commons on March 9 1914, he proposed that any Ulster county that wished to should be allowed to opt out of Home Rule for a period of 6 years, after which time they would automatically come under the operation of the Act. This suggestion, as Asquith well knew, was not acceptable to the Unionists, and Carson made his celebrated reply: "We do not want sentences of death with a stay of execution for six years".

Bonar Law, of course, also spoke in the debate and derided the suggestion. He characterised Asquith's offer to the Ulster Unionists as follows:

> You have by your organisation, extending over two years, placed yourselves in a position of commanding strength. You have entrenched yourselves in a commanding fortress, and, therefore, I do not ask you to submit now to a Nationalist Parliament. What I do ask is that you should destroy your organisation, and that you should leave your fortress, and then, when you are weak, you will be compelled to do what to-day, when you are strong, you will not do.

For the rest of his speech, he ran through the points that he had used throughout the previous 2 years. He insisted that his rejection was on behalf of the British Unionists only, Carson would be left to reject it himself for Ulster. Again he demanded a general election, and again he argued that Home Rule had not been a properly debated issue during the elections of 1910 and that the Government did not hold

a mandate for it. He claimed that he would accept some form of referendum as an alternative, and that only by an appeal to the people could civil strife be avoided. This was the only way out: the Government must recognise the fact and act with due responsibility, for the Unionists would never back down.

> There has never been any suggestion that we here in England or Scotland would resist the proposals of the Government, either passively or actively. There has never been any such threat. The threat, or rather the determination to resist, comes from Ulster, and from Ulster alone. Our share in it has only been this, as we have stated that if Ulster does resist, as we believe, until the matter is decided by the people, they are right in doing, we will support them. I really do not see what other course was possible to us (33).

It was the last major pronouncement he made on the subject before the outbreak of the war, and a fitting summary of his campaign against Home Rule. Negotiations continued intermittently between senior members of the parties over the next few months. They culminated in the Buckingham Palace Conference at the end of July. For 3 days 2 leaders from each of the 4 parties involved, Bonar Law attended with Lansdowne, tried unsuccessfully to define an acceptable form of Ulster exclusion. They failed to decide on the area to be excluded, and did not even get onto the harder topic of the length of time exclusion would run for. The Conference was abandoned, and within a week the infinitely more appalling arrival of major crisis in Europe diverted attention away from crisis in Ireland.

Bonar Law had come to the leadership of the Conservatives almost by accident. In him, they had found a leader who

was very different to anything they had had before, a representative of Scottish commercial Unionism and a representative of the traditional links that bound the west of Scotland and the north east of Ireland. As we have seen, he was content to work within the traditional structure of Unionism, while never really being or becoming a part of it. He did not talk of changing or modernising Unionism, but he did nonetheless provide an utterly new type of leadership, both in style and content.

He brought to the opposition to Home Rule a ruthless determination that at times bordered on desperation. Not only was he prepared to subvert the normal channels and processes of government, he proclaimed his willingness to do so loudly and often. Nothing that the new Labour Party in Parliament said was as revolutionary in its approach to the constitution as what was said by the leader of the party of authority, of law and order, of tradition. Much of that party was unhappy with the implications of what he was doing, with bullying the King, tampering with the position of the army, and threatening to support violent resistance to the elected government. But Bonar Law succeeded in keeping his party behind him because he was seen to be succeeding in harrying Asquith and Redmond, and harrying them with such effect. With Carson and the Ulster Unionists he had found the greatest weakness of Home Rule.

He exploited this weakness to the utmost, and succeeded in forcing Asquith and Redmond to recognise the impossibility

of passing Home Rule without concessions to Ulster. They might have tried to weather confrontation with Carson alone. But Law made it clear that it would never be Carson alone, and that British Unionism would support any Ulster resistance to the Bill. And Law had not found Ulster as simply the greatest weakness of Home Rule, to be played on and used. He had found Ulster as a genuine cause, the main, and ultimately the only cause to be fought over to the end. For him the Home Rule battle was at base about, and only about Ulster. The ruthlessness, the passion, and the willingness to go to any lengths were all rooted in a genuine sympathy with the Ulstermen's distaste for government by a Dublin Parliament.

> Versatility is a dangerous endowment for an English statesman. The ordinary man likes to think that his masters, as the phrase goes, 'attend to business', and regards the liberal arts as things to be generously eulogised at public functions, but not to be practised without a certain loss of prestige.

John Buchan writing about A. J. Balfour in 1914 (34). In many ways this judgement could be applied to Buchan himself. His career, so successful in so many ways was certainly marked by "versatility". Novelist, lawyer, colonial administrator, historian, editor, M.P., journalist and pamphleteer, countryman, and finally Governor-General, his was a classic example of the Scottish success story. A minister's son, his combination of relentless ambition, enthusiasm, and ceaseless application to work carried him to the top of British life.

As he himself wrote:

> I have been privileged to know, and in some cases to know well, most of the people of our time whose personalities have influenced their contemporaries (35).

Only perhaps in the House of Commons, he sat for the Scottish Universities for 8 years from 1927, did he really fail to take a prominent place. He was already too distinguished, and was also too impatient of the ties of party, to make the slow and dogged start required of a new M.P. And he suffered from the suspicion that he had written about apropos of Balfour.

After his death in 1940, it became for a time the fashion to deride Buchan. His fiction was dismissed as consisting of merely ephemeral yarns, and was accused, with some justification, of being authoritarian and racist, in particular anti-semitic. The relentless pursuit of the world's prizes, that took him from a Scottish manse to end his life as Governor-General of Canada, also helped to eclipse his reputation. He was seen as too successful in too many fields to have been a man of real substance in any of them, and was felt to have courted success for its own sake and sometimes at the expense of his own convictions.

In Scotland he had been regarded with some suspicion during his lifetime for his eagerness to assimilate into the English upper-class. He married a cousin of the Duke of Westminster, bought a manor in Oxfordshire, and set up as a country gentleman. In particular, he developed a passion for Eton, where he sent his sons; not only were most of the

heroes in his books Old Etonians but he tended to sprinkle these novels with Etonian allusions. In his autobiography he wrote of his education at Hutchesons' Grammar School in Glasgow, a very distinguished school founded in the seventeenth century.

> I never went to school in the conventional sense, for a boarding school was beyond the narrow means of my family (36).

This by then quite unconscious remark was not well received in Scotland.

In the last 20 years Buchan's reputation has re-asserted itself. This revival began with Janet Adam Smith's brilliant biography of him in 1965 (37). Little attention is now paid to his public career, though he is still remembered in Canada more than most Governors-General. It is on his novels that his name has re-built itself and for which it will continue to be regarded. The clear and straightforward prose and the mixture of powerful description and strong plots, the very things that caused some critics to write him off, are now recognised as the genuine hallmarks of, to use a hackneyed phrase in its true sense, a master story-teller. The books are not, as he used to describe them himself, simply "shockers". Through them runs the same central theme: the thinness of the veneer of civilization, the ever-present threat of collapse, and the enduringly optimistic image of the man who struggles and survives (38).

Any close examination of his career also reveals that, despite the enthusiasm for England and her ruling class,

Buchan remained essentially a very Scottish figure. He was intensely proud of Scotland and took a keen interest in Scottish matters as an M.P. Of all his achievements the one that gave him the greatest personal pleasure was being appointed Lord High Commissioner of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland one year. Paradoxically, he also remained a fundamentally democratic man. He counted among his friends people from all classes and was not blind to the absurdities of the English upper-class. When he was made Governor-General of Canada he wished to remain simply John Buchan and only agreed to take a title on the express orders of the King. For his title he looked not to his estate in Oxfordshire but to the Scottish border country of his ancestors. Perhaps a comparison can be made here, if nowhere else, with J. M. Barrie. Both men became part of English life but remained very Scottish and remained Scottish authors.

The bulk of Buchan's career lies outside the scope of this study, both in subject and chronologically. His writing spanned a long period; his first book appearing in 1894 when he was a student and his last in 1941, the year after he died. He did, however, have some interesting things to say about Scotland and Ireland in the years up to 1920.

As a student in the 1890s Buchan was a great admirer of Scott and Stevenson, in whose tradition much of his own work was to lie. He was reading widely in all Scottish literature and enjoying nearly everything with the exception

of the Kailyard School, in whom he could never see any merit (39). Partly because it was fashionable, he took an interest in Celtic literature:

> I cultivated a sentiment for all things Scottish and brought the Highlands and Islands into the orbit of my interest. A quarter of my blood was Highland and in that I developed a new pride, for it was a time when people talked of the 'Celtic twilight' and Mr. Yeats had just published his Wind Among the Reeds (40).

Despite the half-humorous reference to "cultivating a sentiment", he kept up his enthusiasm for good Celtic literature. He tried his own hand at it only once: publishing a poem "The Last Song of Oisin" in 1901 (41). He probably realised his own talents did not lie in that direction, and was well aware of the absurdities Celticism could produce:

> By dint of doubtful syntax, halting lines, the judicious use of a few epithets like 'pale', 'wan', 'dim', 'wandering', and plentiful references to the planetary system, you can produce a kind of effect which foolish people may call 'Celtic glamour'. But there is nothing in the substance or form of such writing to make it poetry. As often as not it is only a platitude obscurely expressed. Sometimes there is a thin prettiness about it, a touch of fancy or melody; but all minor verse has these faint graces. Much of our modern Celtic poetry is pretty, but nonsense (42).

But he had a genuine enthusiasm for good Celtic literature. He much admired the work of Lady Gregory, for example: she had discovered the "perfect medium" for retelling the ancient Irish legends and had a lovely style that "the peasant can understand and the scholar delight in" (43).

By 1905 he was established as a writer of both fiction and journalistic pieces. He had gained much experience and made new friends during 2 years in Milner's "Kindergarten" in

South Africa. He was contributing regularly to St. Loe Strachey's Spectator, and now went to work for Nelsons in Edinburgh. There he edited encyclopedias and several series of cheap reprints of notable books, both novels and non-fiction. At the beginning of 1907 the editorship of the Christian Leader was added to his responsibilities. Nelsons had bought this very churchy weekly in 1905. Buchan changed its name to the Scottish Review and Christian Leader and endeavoured to model it on The Spectator. His aims were similar to those who had established the Scots Observer, to which he perhaps looked back: he wanted it to look at politics and literature in all countries from a Scottish base and perspective.

In style it was informative, but invariably dignified and a little ponderous. Politically, it tended to be Liberal and sympathetic, if not enthusiastic, towards the Irish. It praised the Liberal government's plans for some Irish devolution and for settling the Irish university problem: "both proposals seem to us to be eminently sound and practicable". It had to be admitted though that "neither problem is simple, and both will defy a supine or timid statesmanship" (44).

In due course the devolution proposal, which had few friends inside or outside Ireland, was dropped. The Scottish Review reflected:

> Probably the Irish Nationalists would have accepted the measure from a Conservative government; but from a Liberal government they expect more, and reject the less in hope of the greater. The whole incident is

> unfortunate, but we see no warrant for the claim of the Opposition that it has irretrievably damaged the Government's prestige. Ireland has rejected a boon, and has thereby damaged the cause of her own progress. But the Government fulfilled their duty in making the offer, and it is not their blame if their friendly overtures are repulsed (45).

Birrell, the Irish Secretary, did succeed in putting through the act to amend Irish university conditions. As we have seen in the chapter on Haldane, this problem had been around a long time, and the Review was suitably approving at its resolution:

> The very mention of Irish University Education has been a red rag to many bulls, and hitherto the wit of man has failed to devise a scheme that would satisfy Irish Catholics without enraging British Nonconformists. But Mr. Birrell has brilliantly triumphed, the only objectors being the Ulster Orangemen, who gathered 24 'Noes' into their lobby - 'Four and Twenty Blackbirds' as some Nationalist wittily ejected (46).

If it supported concessions to Ireland, the Review was nonetheless frequently irritated by the Irish members and strong in its condemnation of agrarian crime. It ran a series of leaders on the iniquities of cattle-driving, "as plain an infringement of the criminal law as murder and housebreaking", which would need to be dealt with under the provisions of a Crimes Act: "We dislike recourse to arbitrary processes as much as anybody, but even that is better than that the safety of law-abiding citizens should be imperilled" (47).

The Scottish Review ran articles enthusiastically describing new work in Celtic literature: the Gaelic League in Ireland, for example, was doing "splendid work" (48). Such articles may have been inspired by Buchan, the political ones were

not. For he was a Unionist. He had presumably concentrated on improving the general quality of his weekly and leaving its political stance unchanged. We have seen too, in chapter 3, how he also published the Scottish Home Rule articles of John Gulland M.P., though Buchan, while sympathetic, was not a Scottish Home Ruler either. In any event, he had failed to keep the support of the magazine's readers, who it seemed had preferred it before he tried to enlarge its scope. The Scottish Review closed at the end of 1908.

Buchan was a Unionist because he was an imperialist. He had enjoyed his time in South Africa and shared Milner's imperial vision. He was also a Unionist because he believed that the Liberal party, particularly in Scotland, had become too much of an unquestioning establishment. It was not progressive and forward-looking, but merely orthodox. In an article in Blackwoods, entitled "The Intellectual Bankruptcy of Liberalism", he advanced this line and claimed that no logical arguments could be brought forward for any of the Liberals' main platforms (49). Writing in the same periodical after the first general election of 1910, he observed:

> Scottish Liberalism is one of the most stubborn and feudal forms of conservatism that we know. It is loyalty partly to a tradition and partly to a man, for the spirit of Mr. Gladstone still walks on Scottish soil, and the echoes of Midlothian have not died away (50).

In 1911 he was adopted as the prospective Unionist candidate for Peebles and Selkirk. The seat had been Liberal Unionist from 1886 to 1908, but was by then fairly safely Liberal.

Buchan worked hard in the constituency until the war broke out. Because of the war, he of course never fought an election (51).

On his own admission, he was an advanced Unionist. He was a free trader and greatly disliked Chamberlain's plans for tariff reform. He was also reported by the Peebles News to favour abolition of the hereditary principle in the House of Lords; the News covered his adoption under the heading: "Is the Candidate a Liberal?" (52). The candidate was not a Liberal: he did indeed hold progressive views, but the reason he was not a Liberal, growing out of his imperialism, was Ireland. He accused the Irish Party of hiding its disloyalty and desire for separation under a cloak of reasonableness:

> Mr. Redmond's new manner is not convincing and it is certainly far from pleasing. This talk of brotherhood and moderation comes ill from one with such a record. Like the wolf in the fable, he may disguise his voice with chalk, but the harsh tones re-assert themselves. He did himself more justice in his old rumbustious style than in this strain of cooing sweetness. The one thing certain is that this type of oratory is never going to convince the British people (53).

In December 1912 he delivered a major speech attacking the third Home Rule Bill. He argued that the Bill would create problems, not solve them. There would inevitably be conflict between the Imperial and Irish parliaments, and the Imperial and Irish chancellors. Endless time would have to be spent by the Imperial parliament discussing such disagreements; far from easing the congestion of business in the Commons, it would make it worse. But more important

than the practical problems were the 2 underlying Unionist principles. The first was Ulster, on which Buchan felt very strongly. The second was

> a universal truth in politics - the principle that union is strength, that the rights and duties of the whole cannot be sacrificed to the selfishness and vanity of the part. When the whole forces of civilisation are moving towards union, are we alone to fall out of line? (54).

In brief, one could say of Buchan's early career that he liked Irish writing but disliked Irish politics. As his daughter put it, in a form hardly complimentary to Ireland: "Pornography and the Irish were regarded by him with equal distaste (the poetry of Yeats and A. E. excepted)" (55). He loved ancient Irish myths, but feared and loathed more recent ones that fuelled nationalism. He was a very progressive Unionist in most ways, but though he may have had his reservations about Bonar Law, he shared his leader's dislike of Home Rule. As with Bonar Law, he saw Ulster as an insuperable obstacle, his church background again being influential here. He also held strongly to the imperial objection to Home Rule, his enthusiasm for the Empire being based on his South African experiences.

In his novel The Three Hostages (1924), Buchan gives this portrait of the Irish villain of the story:

> He's the déraciné Irish, such as you find in America. I take it that he imbibed from that terrible woman - I've never met her, but I see her plainly, and I know that she is terrible - he imbibed that venomous hatred of imaginary things - an imaginary England, an imaginary civilisation, which they call love of country. There is no love in it. They think there is, and sentimentalize about an old simplicity, and spinning wheels and turf fires and an uncouth language,

> but it's all hollow. There's plenty of decent plain folk in Ireland, but his kind of deracine is a ghastly throw-back to something you find in the dawn of history, hollow and cruel like the fantastic gods of their own myths. Well, you start with this ingrained hate (56).

This passage surely demonstrates an interest in Irish history and politics. The character described is called Dominic Medina and it does not seem fanciful to see echoes of Eamon de Valera in the cadences of the name. The "terrible woman" is Medina's mother which can well be taken as a reference to Parnell's career, since he was traditionally supposed to have absorbed a hatred of England from her. A quotation from another of Buchan's Hannay novels, the brilliant wartime story Mr. Standfast (1918), provides a vivid picture of the resentment Buchan believed the ordinary Scot came to have for the Irish. He put the passage into the mouth of one of the heroes of the novel, Andrew, a traditional Liberal radical: he is in conversation with Hannay:

> But the average man on the Clyde, like the average man in other places, hates just three things, and that's the Germans, the profiteers, as they call them, and the Irish. But he hates the Germans most.
>
> The Irish! I exclaimed in astonishment.
>
> Ay, the Irish, cried the last of the old Border radicals. Glasgow's stinkin' nowadays with two things, money and Irish. I mind the day when I followed Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule policy, and used to threep about the noble, generous, warm-hearted nation held in a foreign bondage. My Goad! I'm not speakin' about Ulster, which is a dour, ill-natured den, but our own folk all the same. But the men that will not do a han's turn to help the war and take the chance of our necessities to set up a bawbee rebellion ore hateful to Goad and man. We treated them like pet lambs and that's the thanks we get. They're coming over here in thousands to tak the jobs of the lads that are dooing their duty (57).

CHAPTER 8: THE SCOTTISH CELTIC MOVEMENT

> No one that I ever knew used so few words as W. P. or did more with them. His 'Good' was worth pages of elaborate praise.... But his condemnations were as emphatic as his praises. I shall always remember his comment when I told him that William Sharp had confided to a friend of mine that whenever he was preparing to write as Fiona Macleod he dressed himself entirely in woman's clothes. 'Did he?' said W. P. - 'the bitch!'.
>
> E. V. Lucas

The last years of the nineteenth century in Ireland produced a remarkable growth of Gaelic and Celtic consciousness and literature. Primarily associated with the Gaelic League, and with the group of writers around William Butler Yeats, this movement originally dated from a less literary event, the foundation by Michael Cusack in 1884 of the Gaelic Athletic Association. The Gaelic League, under the direction of Douglas Hyde and Eoin MacNeill, followed in 1893. Yeats was involved with various literary ventures and societies, the most famous being the Abbey Theatre, and became the leading figure in a very distinguished circle of Anglo-Irish writers which included Lady Gregory, John Eglinton and J. M. Synge. The Gaelic League and the Anglo-Irish writers differed on the type of Gaelic or Celtic writing Ireland needed, but both groups were concerned to produce a recognisably Irish literature.

Many people felt that these literary developments were part of a general Celtic resurgence embracing all the Celtic nation of Britain. The most famous exposition of this view was by the Canadian journalist Grant Allen. Despite its title, 'The Celt in English Art' (1891), was a brilliant

and witty article on the importance of things Celtic in modern and radical movements.

> The return wave of Celtic influence over Teutonic or Teutonized England has brought with it many strange things, good, bad, and indifferent. It has brought with it Home Rule, Land Nationalization, Socialism, Radicalism, the Reverend Hugh Price Hughes, the Tithes War, the Crofter Question, the Plan of Campaign. It has brought fresh forces into political life - the eloquent young Irishman, the perfervid Highland Scot, the enthusiastic Welshman, the hard-headed Cornish miner: Methodism, Catholicism, the Eisteddfod, the parish priest; New Tipperary, the Hebrides, the Scotland division of Liverpool; Donybeare, Cunninghame Graham, Michael Davitt, Holyoake; Co-operation, the Dockers, the Star, the Fabians. Powers hitherto undreamt of surge up in our parliamentary world in the Sextons, the Healys, the Atherley Joneses, the McDonalds, the O'Briens, the Dillons, the Morgans, the Abrahams; in our wider public life in the William Morrises, the Annie Besants, the Father Humphreys, the Archbishop Crokes, the General Booths, the Alfred Russel Wallaces, the John Stuart Blackies, the Joseph Arches, the Bernard Shaws, the John Burnses; the People's Palace, the Celtic Society of Scotland, the Democratic Federation, the Socialist League.

Allen went on to list the more literary and artistic manifestations of the Celt coming into "the very thick and forefront of the actual fray" (1).

As with Home Rule, it would be quite wrong to see the Celtic movement as an exclusively Irish growth, later influencing Scotland. Indeed, the first and most important impetus to the rediscovery of the Celtic past, which Scotland and Ireland shared, came from Scotland. This was the work of James MacPherson, whose Ossian poems, bogus as they may have been, exerted an enormous influence on the European romantic movement. As Hugh MacDiarmid, among others noted, this influence extended to Ireland:

> Directly and indirectly, Macpherson exerted an influence on Ireland. An Irish 'Ossianic Society' was

> founded, which did fine work, and it was as a result of the European romantic movement, to which he contributed so much, that Anglo-Ireland discovered in the nineteenth century an interest in Gaelic literature (2).

A Celtic movement did develop in Scotland in the late nineteenth century. Celtic Societies were founded, notably in Edinburgh and by a group of London Scots, to study and celebrate Celtic history and literature. This movement was, however, certainly if compared to that in Ireland, rather a minor affair. If one looks for the literary events that caused a stir in Scotland, one does not find them amongst the Celtic writers. Interest was primarily focused on Lowland authors, for whom this was a fruitful period. Stevenson died in 1894, John Buchan's first novel was published in 1895. Above all, this was the era of the so-called Kailyard school. The Scottish equivalent of the riots that greeted the performance of Synge's The Playboy of the Western World was not anything associated with the Celtic movement, but the publication of George Douglas Brown's anti-Kailyard novel The House with the Green Shutters.

The Scottish Celtic movement produced only 3 important names at the end of the nineteenth century: Patrick Geddes, William Sharp, and, above all, Fiona Macleod. Geddes, however, saw it as only one of an enormous range of subjects he was involved with; and Sharp and Macleod were the same person. Nonetheless, the work they produced is of some interest and relevance here.

The collaboration of Geddes and Sharp began in 1895. Sharp was 40 years old, Geddes a year older. Both were Scottish born, but had spent time away from Scotland. Geddes had studied under Thomas Huxley in London and travelled in Mexico before settling in Edinburgh where his principal work was the study and teaching of biology. His interests, however, covered a much wider field and included economics and town planning, as well as more conventional subjects for a biologist such as evolution. He held strong and frequently unorthodox views on many unrelated topics. Combining them with a pugnacious manner, he was adept at upsetting people, particularly the more traditionally trained academics of Edinburgh.

Sharp was principally a journalist, an art and literary critic and editor who spent most of his working life in London. He was an enthusiastic traveller and had visited Australia and North America as well as many European countries. As befitted an art critic, his special love was Italy. In London he had been befriended by Dante Gabriel Rossetti, whose circle he joined and whose biography he subsequently wrote (1882). It was the first of a long series of books about poets, and editions of their works, which rapidly descended to hackwork. Though he spent periods with Geddes in Edinburgh, Sharp was continuously on the move throughout Europe. Their collaborations in authorship and editing were mostly conducted by post (3).

When he came to Edinburgh, Sharp had written one book under the pseudonym Fiona Macleod: Pharais (1894). That Sharp

and Macleod were the same person was the literary world's best kept secret. Fiona Macleod was supposed to be Sharp's cousin, who lived in the Highlands. Only a few close friends were aware that Sharp was Fiona Macleod. Among them was Geddes, though not initially, Geddes' wife, as a letter to her from Sharp in 1895 shows.

> Well, were you very surprised when Geddes told you that WS and Fiona Macleod are one and the same person? I could not resist the temptation to write to you as FM, in response to your kind letter:... Still, I did not mean to leave you long in the misunderstanding, of course. I need hardly say I have every confidence in you as well as in him, as to absolute preservation of my secret: even if the subject, by any hazard, come up in conversation anytime (4).

There was much speculation about Fiona Macleod, some people even believing her to be W. B. Yeats. Those who did believe that must have thought Yeats very mischievous or devious, as he frequently reviewed the Fiona Macleod books, as we shall see. At any rate they were not paying Yeats any great compliment, as the Fiona Macleod works were hardly in the same class as his own. The secret was not revealed until Sharp's death in 1905, when the novelist Richard Whiteing released the following announcement to the press:

> By private telegram from Sicily, I am informed of the death of the well-known English writer, (sic) William Sharp, and I am authorised to reveal his authorship of the works published under the pseudonym 'Fiona Macleod' (5).

The biography of Sharp written by his wife Elizabeth revealed that several people had correctly identified Fiona Macleod as Sharp, but had been subdued by Sharp's vigorous, though untruthful, denials. Sharp had further complicated

his life by carrying on a correspondence with Yeats and others both as himself and as Fiona Macleod. Quite why Sharp used the pseudonym at all, and the more entertaining question of why he used a female pseudonym, neither Sharp himself, nor his wife or his more recent biographers have satisfactorily explained. Certainly it increased the strain on his already poor health. For not only did he produce quite a substantial body of work as Fiona Macleod, but he was forced to continue to write as William Sharp to allay the doubts of those close to the secret. He also incurred extra effort in evading those mischievous, or genuinely curious enough to express a desire to meet the Highland authoress.

Sharp came to Edinburgh to assist Geddes with a publishing firm he wished to start. Geddes wanted to put out books in 2 fields: scientific studies, and works to promote a Scots Renascence, as he referred to it. It was for the latter task that Sharp was appointed literary manager of "Patrick Geddes and Colleagues". Their main achievement was The Evergreen, "a Northern seasonal". Four volumes were produced, one for each season, during 1895 and 1896. The Evergreen was very much a fin de siècle production, in the style of The Yellow Book or The Savoy. Illustrations and a decorated cover were major features, of a type that combined Art Nouveau with Celtic motifs. The written contents divided Celtic articles, stories and poems with European ones. For Geddes looked as much to the continent for inspiration as he did to the Highlands and Ireland. Belgium,

and particularly the work of Maurice Maeterlinck, were especial favourites of both Geddes and Sharp. Though we shall be looking at Geddes' Celtic interests here, it is important to remember that he looked also to the revival of Scotland's links with the continent to provide the inspiration for a renaissance of Scottish culture.

The flavour of The Evergreen can be illustrated by 2 quotations from the first number: one from the "Proem", the other the conclusion of Geddes' article "The Scots Renascence".

> This then, in the Springtime, would be our particular variation, if only we might achieve it perfectly: to think and to dream, to rhyme and to picture, in unison with the music of the Renascence. Of that music we hear as yet only broken snatches. But in these snatches four chords are sounded, which we would fain carry in our hearts - That faith may be had still in the friendliness of fellows; that the love of country is not a lost cause; that the love of women is the way of life; and that in the eternal newness of every child is an undying promise for the race.
>
> Such is our Scottish, our Celtic Renascence - sadly set twixt the keening, the watching over our fathers dead, and the second-sight of shroud rising about each other. Yet this is the Resurrection and the Life, when to faithful love and memory their dead arise.

These may not read as either very elegant or very profound today, but The Evergreen enjoyed moderate success at the time. Geddes persuaded Fisher Unwin to undertake London distribution but, owing partly to Geddes' lack of financial attention to detail, it never paid for itself. Later criticism of the "seasonal" has been mixed. Holbrook Jackson in his magisterial study The Eighteen Nineties described it as "handsome" (6). A study of nineties illustration published in the 1930s was anything but

enthusiastic: "The production was rather dour and very Scotch, printed on uncompromising cartridge paper and seasoned with the grim earnestness of the art student" (7). It echoed a contemporary criticism by H. G. Wells who, reviewing this first number, wrote succinctly if unkindly: "it is bad from cover to cover; and even the covers are bad" (8).

The next number of The Evergreen, "Autumn", also appeared in 1895. In a preface Geddes actually stated what his editorial policy was:

> Amongst the local and national traditions which are interesting many Scotsmen to-day, the present issue of 'Evergreen' is particularly concerned with two. These are the Celtic Renascence, now incipient alike in Literature and Art, and the revival and development of the old continental sympathies of Scotland.

The latter was represented by a study of the Belgian Charles van Lerberghe, the former by a contribution by Fiona Macleod. This was a curious interweaving of Celtic folk tale and the nativity story, "Mary of the Gael".

The issue received an encouraging notice in Robertson Nicoll's Bookman. The review was hardly objective, however, as the author, Victor Branford, was a member of Geddes' circle, and was probably "V. V. B." who actually co-wrote the preface with Geddes. As a close friend of Geddes, his review was interesting in that it went rather further in several directions than Geddes himself.

> Amongst the 'local and national traditions' which patriotic Scotsmen are to-day trying to revive and keep alive, the present Evergreen specially concerns itself with those connected with Scottish nationalism, Celtic literature and art, and the old continental sympathies

> of Scotland.... In the incipient Celtic Renascence, Ireland has played a much more conspicuous part than Scotland. But the writings of Miss Fiona Macleod are gradually disclosing to the British public quite another Scotland than that which Lowland writers have familiarized them with. And it is generally overlooked, too, that in Art the Glasgow School, in consideration of its local origin and its emphasis on colour and decorative treatment of subject, may be counted congenitally part of the Celtic Renascence (9).

The first part of this quotation was, of course, lifted directly from the preface, with the exception of the phrase "Scottish nationalism". Both Geddes and Sharp were quite deliberately not promoting nationalism: they wished Scotland to be artistically prominent but cosmopolitan, a word they both used. Sharp in particular, as we shall see, was distinctly nervous of nationalism, which he saw as a divisive force. Neither were Sharp and Geddes really enthusiastic about any direct comparisons with Ireland. They occupied an ambivalent position in which they talked and wrote of a Celtic Renaissance, but shied away when anyone else used the phrase and linked them to it. Sharp wrote to a friend after the publication of Pharais:

> I resent too close identification with the so-called Celtic renaissance. If my work is to depend solely on its Gaelic connection, then let it go, as go it must. My work must be beautiful in itself - Beauty is a Queen and must be served as a Queen (10).

In 1895 "Patrick Geddes and Colleagues" published 2 Fiona Macleod books: The Sin-Eater and Other Tales and The Washer of the Ford. A prologue dedicated The Sin-Eater to George Meredith, and in this prologue Fiona Macleod wrote:

> Some of my critics, heedless of the complex conditions which differentiate the Irish and the Scottish Celt, complain of the Celtic gloom that dusks the life of

> the men and women I have tried to draw. That may be just. I wish merely to say that I have not striven to depict the blither Irish Celt (11).

It is difficult to tell what critics Sharp was referring to. The implication was that they must be Irish critics, and certainly Irish Gaelic Leaguers were to be irritated by Fiona Macleod's insistence on Celtic gloom. They, after all, were interested in portraying a Celt insurgent and vigorous. But such criticism was in the future, and The Sin-Eater was welcomed in Ireland. Douglas Hyde wrote: "I think Fiona Macleod's books the most interesting thing in the new Scoto-Celtic movement, which I hope will march side by side with our own" (12). A leading article in the Irish Independent enthused.

> The most remarkable figure in the Scottish Celtic Renascence, Miss Fiona Macleod, has now set three books before the public, and it is time to appraise her seriously. She is a poet born.... All she does is namelessly fascinating.... The Sin-Eater will assure Miss Macleod's position with literary people; in this book she has 'arrived'. She is a woman of genius, and, like many people gifted so greatly, her message is often gloomy and terrible. But it is the spirit of the Celt, and her work another triumph for the Celtic genius.

The Northern Whig spoke of her "astonishing range of vocabulary, its richness and its magic", and her "power of fascination which is absolutely irresistible" (13).

"Gloom" was to be one of the key words in Sharp's Fiona Macleod books, along with the phrase "a doomed and passing race", which first appeared in The Sin-Eater. His Celtdom was a land of the past, though it still had things to offer for a British future. This "triumphant defeatism", in the words of one critic, allied to a passionate cosmopoli-

tanism, were the basis of his strong anti-nationalism (14). A "doomed and passing race" had no need of nationalism, particularly of a political kind. In Ireland, however, this was not what they wanted to hear from a Scottish Celtic movement which was, in Douglas Hyde's phrase, to "march side by side with our own". To make matters worse, Sharp did not confine his views to Scotland, but adopted a comprehensive anti-nationalism.

These disagreements, however, were to come later. 1896 was a fruitful year for "Patrick Geddes and Colleagues". "Summer" and "Winter", the last 2 numbers of The Evergreen were brought out, and both contained several Irish contributions. The first had a poem translated from the Gaelic by Douglas Hyde and a poem on Cuculain (sic) by A. P. Graves. "Winter" contained an historical tale by Standish James O'Grady, and a pious and sentimental little story by Katherine Tynan. Douglas Hyde put in a story from Co. Mayo about the duty of giving alms at Christmas, adding a sharp little note: "The following story, ... is no doubt largely due to the vivid imagination of some itinerant mendicant working in his own interest". Even Sharp's contribution as Fiona Macleod was on an Irish theme, a poem "The Love-Kiss of Diarmid and Grainne".

The increased number of Irish authors writing in The Evergreen perhaps underlines Geddes' difficult position. It was difficult for him to run a truly Scottish Celtic Renaissance with only one real author, Fiona Macleod. The

Geddes group was weak on Celtic subjects, both because they had other interests to pursue, and because, as Sharp's modern biographer pointed out, none of them probably had any Gaelic (15). Wishing to publish Celtic work, Geddes and Sharp were inevitably forced to turn to the only real live centre of Celtic Renaissance, Ireland. They had their own strong views on what form that renaissance should take, but lacked the base to express them from.

1896 also saw the publication by Geddes of Lyra Celtica: An Anthology of Representative Celtic Poetry. Nominally the book was edited by Sharp's wife, Elizabeth, but the work was really her husband's. He contributed the introduction and notes, under his own name. Sharp had written to Geddes about the book:

> It will have the additional value of being representative, for though mainly Scottish-Celtic and Irish Celtic, there are representative poems by Breton, Cornish, and Welsh, and Manx poets (16).

Though this was true, the largest section by far was "Irish (Modern and Contemporary)", further illustrating the supremacy of Ireland in matters Celtic. Sharp's range here was wide, for it encompassed Emily Bronte and Fanny Parnell as well as Yeats, AE and Douglas Hyde.

In the introduction he ascribed the current Celtic revival "fundamentally" to Ossian, and "immediately" to "the rising of the sap in the Irish nation". The "literary activity of Ireland" had

> again re-asserted itself, and is once more so much in evidence, in Celtic scholarship and in Anglo-Celtic romance and poetry, that the not over-ready attention

of England is perforce drawn to it.

He ended this introduction in typically Sharpian tones:

> The Celt falls, but his spirit rises in the heart and the brain of the Anglo-Celtic peoples, with whom are the destinies of the generations to come.

As well as adding another irritant to his Irish readers, this sentence surely provided a clue to the observant of the identity of Fiona Macleod.

Sharp also wrote in this introduction:

> If it be advisable to select one poet, still 'with a future' as pre-eminently representative of the Celtic genius of to-day, I think there can be little doubt that W. B. Yeats' name is that which would occur first to most lovers of contemporary poetry.

Most critics would agree with Sharp's evaluation, though some contemporaries placed Sharp himself alongside Yeats:

> The Neo-Celtic literary movement ... (was) largely a result of the enthusiasm of the two Williams, Kings, as it were, of the Celtic domain, William the first or William Sharp and William the second or William Butler Yeats (17).

Sharp's tribute to Yeats was a tribute to their friendship, as it was to Yeats' work. This friendship had grown in the late 1880s. Sharp followed Yeats' work with enthusiasm, and Yeats was also to appreciate the writings of Fiona Macleod, though with a critical eye, and without realising their source. Yeats had a good knowledge of and interest in Scottish literature.

In 1893 he had published "A Remonstrance with Scotsmen for having soured the disposition of their ghosts and faeries". This attractively humorous essay, in The Celtic Twilight, accused the Scots of an inability to accommodate their fairy

spirits or make allowances for them. The Scots, he wrote, pursue them, persecute them and "denounce them from the pulpit". This persecution turns Scottish goblins and sprites malevolent. Whereas in Ireland they are responsible for "gay and graceful doings", in Scotland they perpetrate "deeds of terror".

In the mid-1890s Yeats was writing and reviewing regularly for The Bookman, the literary monthly edited by William Robertson Nicoll. In 1895 he contributed a 4 part article on "Irish National Literature". In the final part he made the interesting suggestion that Scottish literature was more solidly nationally rooted than Irish:

> The time has not yet come for Irishmen, as it has for Scotsmen, to carry about with them a subtle national feeling, no matter when, or of what they write, because that feeling has yet to be perfectly elaborated and expounded by men of genius with minds as full of Irish history, scenery, and character as the minds of Burns and Scott were full of Scottish history, scenery and character (18).

Yeats, therefore, brought a knowledge of, and interest in, Scottish literature as well as matters Celtic to his critical appreciation of Fiona Macleod. He wrote warmly of The Sin-Eater, and Sharp sent him a copy of The Washer of the Ford. Yeats wrote "a long critical letter" about this work to Fiona Macleod, whose existence he accepted as a matter of course (19). "She" replied:

> How good of you to write to me as you did. Believe me, I am grateful. There is no other writer whose good opinion could please me more - for I love your work, and take an endless delight in your poetry.... Most cordially I thank you for your critical remarks. Even where I do not unreservedly agree, or where I venture to differ ... I have carefully pondered all

> you say.... When my ... book of verse is ready - it is to be called From the Hills of Dream - it will give me such sincere pleasure to send you a copy (20).

In due course, Yeats reviewed this book of poems in The Bookman, giving it a friendly but critical welcome (21).

The next Fiona Macleod work to appear was a novel, Green Fire. On this book Yeats wrote to the author:

> I have read 'Green Fire' since I saw you. I do not think it is one of your well-built stories, and I am certain that the writing is constantly too self-consciously picturesque; but the atmosphere, the romance of much of it, of 'The Herdsman' part in particular, haunts me ever since I laid it down (22).

The point that Fiona Macleod's writing tended to be "too self-consciously picturesque" was one of Yeats' main, and thoroughly justified, reservations about all her work. He was sufficiently enthusiastic, however, to discuss Fiona Macleod with his friend George Russell, the poet AE. AE did like the book and wrote a long mystical letter to Fiona Macleod:

> My friend, Willie Yeats, has just come by me wrapt in a faery whirlwind, his mouth speaking great things. He talked much of reviving the Druidic mysteries and vaguely spoke of Scotland and you. These stirring ideas of his are in such a blaze of light that, but for the inspiration of a presence always full of enthusiasm, I would get no ideas at all from him. But when he mentioned your name and spoke of the brotherhood of the Celts and what ties ought to unite them, I remembered a very kindly letter which I had put on one side waiting for an excuse to write again....
>
> ... I read Green Fire a few weeks ago and have fallen in love with your haunted seas.... Some time when the power falls on me I'll send a shadow of myself over seas just to get the feeling of the Highlands.... (23).

Sharp was happy enough with the notion of "the brotherhood of the Celts" in artistic terms, but Yeats and AE, though

by no means the most political of Irishmen, hoped to extend the power of Celtic writing to include a revival of Irish national life. Here, as we have seen, they left Sharp behind them, though, as his next letter to Fiona Macleod showed, Yeats obviously still hoped to convert him.

> I have some hopes that Mr. Sharp will come to Paris on his way back to England. I have much to talk over with him, I am feeling more and more every day that our Celtic movement is approaching a new phase. Our instrument is sufficiently prepared as far as Ireland is concerned, but the people are less so, and they can only be stirred by the imagination of a very few acting on all.

This letter, written at the beginning of 1897, is also of interest for a passage in it about Celtic drama.

> I have just now a plan I want to ask you about? Our Irish Literary and Political literary organisations are pretty complete ... and I think it would be very possible to get up Celtic plays through these societies. They would be far more effective than lectures and might do more than anything else we can do to make the Irish Scotch and other Celts recognise their solidarity. My own plays are too elaborate, I think, for a start, and have also the disadvantage that I cannot urge my own work in committee. If we have one or two short direct prose plays, of (say) a mythological and folk-lore kind, by you and by some writer (I may be able to move O'Grady, I have already spoken to him about it urgently) I feel sure we could get the Irish Literary Society to make a start (24).

It was, indeed, during this year and the next that Yeats and Edward Martyn discussed the idea of a Celtic drama with Lady Gregory. The long term result of this was the founding of the Abbey Theatre; the short term result the production in 1899 of Yeats' Countess Cathleen. These plays did not quite have the beneficial nationally inspiring effect that Yeats envisaged; the first performance of the Countess Cathleen being "a stormy foretaste of what was in store for any independent-minded dramatist who chose to interpret

Irish themes in his own way" (25). Sharp took up Yeats' suggestion and completed 2 plays on ancient Irish subjects, though, as we shall see, Yeats never used them.

No doubt encouraged by the interest shown in Fiona Macleod's work by Yeats, Hyde and AE, Sharp decided to visit Ireland in the summer of 1897. Though he had travelled widely throughout Europe, it was his first trip to Ireland. It was a great success and Sharp enjoyed himself. He went to Dublin to meet AE, and then on to Edward Martyn's Tulira Castle in Galway. Martyn took him for tours in the surrounding countryside and arranged a literary week-end, inviting Yeats, Standish J. O'Grady, Douglas Hyde and Lady Gregory. Truly he was in the thick of the Celtic revival. He even had an exciting ride in an Irish car on arrival, complete with a driver who obviously knew just what strangers expected of him!

> I forgot to tell you that I arrived late - and of course at Athenry only - some 14 miles from here. I had to wait some time till a car could be got - and what a drive I had! The man said that 'Plaze God, he would have me at Tull-lyra before the gintry had given me up entoirely' - and he was as good as his word! The night was dark, and the roads near Athenry awful after the recent gale and rains - and it was no joke to hold on to the car. Whenever we came to a particularly bad bit (and I declared afterwards that he took some of the stone dykes at a leap) he cried - 'Now thin yer honour, whin I cry Whiroo! you hold on an' trust to God' - and then came his wild Whiroo! and the horse seemed to spring from the car, and the jarvey and I to be flying alongside, and my rope-bound luggage to be kicking against the stars - and then we came down with a thud, and when I had a gasp of refound breath I asked if the road was as smooth and easy all the way, whereat my friend laughed genially and said 'Be aisy at that now - shure we're coming to the bad bit soon!' (26).

By the middle of 1897, the publishing of "Patrick Geddes and Colleagues" was failing. They had produced a fine edition of Ossian in 1896, edited by Sharp under his own name, and one of Geddes' scientific collaborators had obviously been complaining of the concentration on the Celtic side of the enterprise. Geddes wrote to him in August:

> We are desirous of meeting you in every possible way in our power, and we are anxious that you should clearly understand that while artistic and Celtic publications have mainly occupied us hitherto, this has simply been due to the active initiative of our collaborators in those particular departments, and in no respect obscures the essential and central purpose of our firm: that of the publication of works bearing particularly upon evolution (27).

If the Celtic work had absorbed most of the company's energies, it had not proved financially successful. Many of the letters between Geddes and Sharp had been concerned, from the beginning, with lack of money. There is evidence that neither many of The Evergreen's contributors, nor Sharp himself, had been paid for their work. In November 1896 Geddes tried, without success, to sell the publishing venture as a whole to John Murray (28). Geddes was always impatient of financial detail and meticulous organisation, and while this may have made him a more interesting person, it had not made him a successful publisher.

1897 was to see the last flurry of publications on Celtic themes. The Life and Writings of James Clarence Mangan by D. J. O'Donoghue, the Irish author and compiler of dictionaries of Irish writers and artists, was brought out in

conjunction with Gill in Dublin. Also published were a volume of Breton legends, a romance by Wales' leading contributor to the Celtic revival, Ernest Rhys, and Deirdre, a poem by T. W. Rolleston with illustrations by Althea Gyles. With a Breton, a Welsh and 2 Irish works, it was a reasonable spread though with one obvious exception: there was nothing from Scotland. Again, this illustrates Geddes' central problem with his notions of a Scots renaissance: he had no Scottish authors except for Sharp. And by 1897 he had lost Sharp to the London firm of Fisher Unwin. The Fiona Macleod books were by then extremely successful, and Sharp, who had many contacts throughout London's publishing world, had obviously grown tired of Geddes' unorthodox and unprofitable methods. In March 1897 he wrote apropos of "Patrick Geddes and Colleagues":

> I do not quite understand why Prof. Geddes writes a joint letter to you and me, particularly as (he) knows that I have no longer any connection with the firm (29).

Geddes, indeed, was starting to move away from publishing altogether, and none of the planned books on evolution ever appeared under his imprint. The last work he published was in 1900, and it reflected his continental interests: a pamphlet on the Dreyfus case. His enthusiasm had turned to town planning, the subject for which his name is mainly remembered today, and he began to spend less and less time in Edinburgh. Publishing had always been only one of a range of concurrent interests for him: he was a highly talented man, but he had the sort of restless mind that was always looking forward to the next venture. The story of

"Patrick Geddes and Colleagues", however, is not entirely one of failure. The Evergreen was an interesting and varied example of the nineties periodical typified by the Yellow Book; and both the edition of Ossian and Lyrica Celtica were useful in content and attractively produced. Geddes' idea for the promotion of Scottish art and letters was a good one: to offer an alternative to a London based culture through the cultivation of links with the other Celtic countries and the continent of Europe. He got the support from outside Scotland from established literary figures. But finding no comparable writers inside the Scottish tradition, except Sharp, he lacked, with his multifarious interests, the tenacity or the inspirational power to produce any new ones (30).

The years 1899 to 1901 saw the appearance of 7 Fiona Macleod works. Sharp had already produced 5 up to that time; he worked remarkably hard, for he was still occasionally publishing under his own name. His health was not good, though it is difficult to tell if this was the result of overwork, or if he wrote so hard because he felt he had a lot to say and would not live long to say it.

Fiona Macleod had an article in the January 1899 Fortnightly Review: "A Group of Celtic Writers". The group she chose to identify were all Irish: Yeats, Hyde, AE, Nora Hopper, Katherine Tynan and Lionel Johnson. (Johnson was not directly an Irishman, but was of Irish descent and was closely identified with Ireland because of his book of poems Ireland and Other Poems, 1897.) The article chided those

who were too free with the word Celtic:

> ... there has been of late too much looseness of phrase concerning the Celtic spirit, the Celtic movement, and that mysterious entity Celticism. The 'Celtic Renascence', the 'Gaelic glamour', these, for the most part, are shibboleths of the journalist who if asked what it is that is being re-born, or what differentiating qualities has the distinction of Gaelic from any other 'glamour', or what constitutes 'glamour' itself, would as we say in the North, be fair taken aback.

Having delivered himself of this rebuke, Sharp was forced to produce some sort of definition himself. It would of course have been possible, and in character, for him to deny the existence of any Celtic school, though it would have stretched contemporaries' credibility. The definition he did produce allowed for the existence of Celtic writing, though it was by any standards low key.

> All that the new generation of Celtic or Anglo-Celtic (for the most part Anglo-Celtic) writers hold in conscious aim, is to interpret anew 'the beauty at the heart of things', not along the line of English tradition but along that of racial instinct, coloured and informed by individual temperament (31).

In April 1899 Fiona Macleod published a more substantial work, the book The Dominion of Dreams. Yeats again reviewed in The Bookman, being more critical than he had been before. In essence, he accused Fiona Macleod of wrapping herself up in word play, at the expense of comprehensibility.

> ... every inspiration has its besetting sin, and perhaps those who are at the beginning of movements have no models and no traditional restraints. She has faults enough to ruin an ordinary writer. Her search for these resemblances brings her beyond the borders of coherence. The bent of nature that makes her turn from circumstance and personalities to symbols and personifications may perhaps leave her liable to an obsession for certain emotional words which have for her a kind of symbolic meaning, but her love of old tales should tell her that the old mysteries are best told in simple words (32).

Sharp was much upset by the criticism and wrote to Yeats. Yeats responded by returning his copy of the book, with the passages he particularly objected to marked. Back came the reply: "I am interested in what you write about The Dominion of Dreams and shall examine with closest attention all your suggestions". The version which appeared in the Collected Works was somewhat revised from the original, according to Elizabeth Sharp on the lines Yeats suggested (33). Truly Yeats had become the arbiter of Celtic matters!

At the end of this Fiona Macleod letter to Yeats about The Dominion of Dreams, Sharp wrote:

> I have not time to write about the plays. Two are typed: the third, the chief, is not yet finished. When all are revised and ready, you can see them (34).

The third play, The Enchanted Valleys, Sharp never finished. Presumably he did send the other 2, The Immortal Hour and The House of Usna to Yeats; they were both on ancient Irish themes, but Yeats cannot have been enthusiastic as he never produced them. Only one of them, The House of Usna, was ever put on: by the Stage Society on April 29 1900. It was played with 2 short plays by Maeterlinck and had a most distinguished producer in Harley Granville Barker. Reading it to-day, it is hard to imagine it being a dramatic success, even in the rarefied atmosphere of the Stage Society (35). One cannot question Yeats' critical acumen in rejecting it, though his decision may have been encouraged by the fact that he was working on a play of his own, Deirdre, on the same subject.

In the spring of 1900 Fiona Macleod published an essay, Celtic, in the Contemporary Review. This essay was Sharp's considered reflection on the topic he had been forced to address himself to: what constituted the Celtic movement. Unfortunately, it read to many simply as an attack on that movement. Because of its importance, considerable quotation is justified, and the extracts below bring out Sharp's salient points.

> There is a beauty in the Homeric hymns that I do not find in the most beautiful of Celtic chants; none could cull from the gardens of the Gael what in the Greek anthology has been gathered out of time to be everlasting; ... the romance that of old flowered among the Gaelic hills flowered also in English meads, by Danish shores, along Teutonic woods and plains.
>
> But it is not well that because of the whistling of the wind in the heather one should imagine that nowhere else does the wind suddenly stir the reeds and the grasses in its incalculable hour.
>
> When I hear that a new writer is of the Celtic school, I am left in some uncertainty, for I know ... of no 'school', or what present elements would form a school. What is a Celtic writer? If the word has any exact acceptance, it must denote an Irish or a Scottish Gael, a Cymric or Breton Celt, who writes in the language of his race. It is obvious that if one would write English literature, one must write in English and in the English tradition.
>
> But there is English emotion, English love of nature, English visionariness, as there is Dutch, or French, or German, or Russian, or Hindu. There is no exclusive national heritage in these things.
>
> I do not know any Celtic visionary so rapt and absolute as the Londoner William Blake, or the Scandinavian Swedenborg, or the Flemish Ruysbroek; or any Celtic poet of nature to surpass the Englishman Keats; nor do I think even religious ecstasy is more seen in Ireland than in Italy.
>
> When I hear that 'only a Celt' could have written this or that passage of emotion or description, I am become impatient of these parrot-cries, for I remember that if all Celtic literature were to disappear, the world would not be so impoverished as by the loss of English

> literature, or French literature, or that of Rome or of Greece.
>
> But above all else it is time that a prevalent pseudo-nationalism should be dissuaded. I am proud to be a Highlander, but I would not side with those who would 'set the heather on fire'. If I were Irish, I would be proud, but I would not lower my pride by marrying it to a ceaseless ill-will, an irreconcilable hate, for there can be a nobler pride in unvanquished acquiescence than in futile revolt.... And proud as I might be to be Highland, or Scottish, or Irish, or Welsh, or English, I would be more proud to be British - for, there at last, we have a bond to unite us all, and to give us a space for every ideal, whether communal or individual, whether national or spiritual (36).

As Sharp himself was to admit, this essay provoked hostile comment in Ireland. This was not surprising. He was, of course, only amplifying and clarifying points he had made before, but he had never made them so trenchantly. Indeed, he wrote nothing else of Fiona Macleod's with such fervour, or so near to bitterness. In a sense, he was writing as himself, the cosmopolitan poet and critic, and putting it under Fiona Macleod's name. But those reading the essay were not to know this: to them it smacked of a writer belittling the only tradition in which she worked. It is possible that Sharp may have resented the success of Fiona Macleod as opposed to the work he put out under his own name. Certainly he resented the use made of Fiona Macleod's work by those surveying the rise of Celtic writing and nationalism.

Had the Celtic movement and Celtic writing not occupied the place it did in Irish life and national thinking at the time, the essay might have passed unnoticed. Many of Sharp's

points were valid, or at least perfectly defensible. But this was not a time for objectivity, and one sentence in particular aroused Irish wrath: "It is obvious that if one would write English literature, one must write in English and in the English tradition". Yeats and many others believed strongly that one could write in English and yet definitely not write in "the English tradition". Sharp was prepared to except work in any of the Celtic languages, but maintained that any writing in English must fit into, and judge itself by, the accepted standards of the English tradition, and a British ideal.

Sharp protested, as he had before, that it was unfair to accuse Fiona Macleod of incorrectly expounding the aims of the Irish Celt. He had always made it clear that he spoke only for the Scots. But by specifically singling out Irish nationalism for criticism, he had in a sense brought the storm upon himself. Had he confined his remarks to the Highlands, the essay, while it would not have been welcomed in Ireland, might have been ignored. In taking Irish nationalism so severely to task he was, of course, only having the courage to express what he must have known would be unpopular opinions, and he deserves credit for it. In fact, he was on very shaky ground in claiming that the Highlander was thoroughly non-political, as he did. Any examination of the 1880s in the Highlands would quickly make that argument, central to the Fiona Macleod philosophy, look very doubtful.

A review of Sharp's, as Fiona Macleod, probably written at about the same time as Celtic, reads most strangely when set against all this. It was a review of Literary Ideals in Ireland by Yeats, AE, John Eglinton and William Larminie (1899).

> I took up this little book with keen anticipation. I read it with disappointment. Neither any in Ireland nor any elsewhere will stand with any more surety because of this book. It is merely a resetting of the old discussion of irreconcilable disputants. I eagerly hoped to find some common spring of conviction, of hope; of ideals: I looked for concerted action, for directed action. Ireland has need of regeneration indeed when her own children are in opposite camps even when marshalled under a common banner.
>
> To judge from this little book, there is no literary ideal in Ireland, but only individual events: there is no singleness of aim, but only a plurality of opinions. Mr. Eglinton urges one thing: Mr Yeats differs: Mr. Eglinton exhortates: Mr. Yeats objects anew: Mr. George Russell intervenes, to interpret each and satisfy neither ...
>
> I hope that ... someone ... will write, not upon the literary ideals, but on the one, inevitable, and supreme literary ideal for Ireland. That ideal, surely, is as little wedded to the blind resentment of the irreconcilable Gael as to the denationalised conventionalism of writers such as Professor Dowden. Born of spiritual suffering, sustained by spiritual longing, its road should be through the country of the spirit (37).

There was nothing surprising about the remark on "blind resentment", and the point about one spiritual ideal was harmless enough. But surely if Sharp was arguing for anything in Celtic and elsewhere, he was arguing for a plurality of opinions, and against the idea of a monolithic Celtic viewpoint.

Book publication of Celtic took place in the summer of 1900, in a volume entitled The Divine Adventure. Also in this was

Iona, a long and attractive essay on the island. Sharp loved Iona; he wrote to Katherine Tynan, for example, from there: "There is a beauty here that no other place has, so unique is it" (38). In the best of the Fiona Macleod works, he manages to convey this enthusiasm in writing about Iona's beauty and antiquity, and St. Columba. Even here, however, the place he loved prompted his melancholy reflections on the Gael.

> A doomed and passing race. I have been taken to task for these words. But they are true, in the deep reality where they obtain. Yes, but true only in one sense, however vital that is. The Breton's eyes are slowly turning from the enchanted West, and slowly his ears are forgetting the whisper of the wind around menhir and dolmen. The Manxman has ever been the mere yeoman of the Celtic chivalry; but even his rude dialect perishes year by year. In Wales, a great tradition survives; in Ireland, a supreme tradition fades through sunset-hued horizons; in Celtic Scotland, a passionate regret, a despairing love and longing, narrows yearly before a dull and incredibly selfish alienism. The Celt has at last reached his horizon. There is no shore beyond. He knows it (39).

There is of course no disputing the decline in numbers speaking the Gaelic languages. However, coming on top of Celtic, this passage could only further alienate the Irish, whose Gaelic traditions he had described as fading, and compared unfavourably with those of the Welsh.

St. Andrew, a Scottish Presbyterian weekly, had also reviewed The Divine Adventure. Its "Books and Bookmen" column commented in May 1900:

> Fiona Macleod, in her latest book 'The Divine Adventure' frankly confesses her opinion that, as to the exclusively Celtic Spirit in literature, 'there never was sich' and that there was never a Celtic school of writers. She is quite right, but her friends and the friends of Mr. William Butler Yeats in Ireland have for several years been doing their best to convince

us of the contrary (4).

St Andrew was a strongly Unionist and anti-Home Rule periodical, though it tended generally to be relatively sympathetic to Irish ideas and writers. Like the Irish Celticists, it was obviously viewing the row over Celtic as primarily political, and therefore pitching in on its own side. Allied to this view of the controversy, their compiler of the "Books and Bookmen" feature seems to have had a personal animus against Yeats. For a month previously he had penned a mocking attack on Yeats' theatre work in Dublin:

> When I was in Dublin the other day, I made great efforts to trace the Irish Literary Theatre, and Mr. Yeats and Mr. Moore, who recently turned their backs on London, to carry the banner of true literature and dramatic art to Ireland. I grieve to state that my efforts were unavailing. The Dublin people seem not to take Mr. Yeats and Mr. Moore quite so seriously as they take themselves, and the 'great successes' we have read of with regard to the Irish Literary Theatre seem, if I am not misinformed, to have meant two or three performances of an Irish play in a little public hall, and latterly in a local theatre hired for the occasion. Mr. Moore's language might naturally lead one to believe that the Irish Literary Theatre was an imposing structure where nothing but Irish plays were performed all the year round (41).

The row over Fiona Macleod spilled over into the debate on the Pan-Celtic movement. The proposal to form a Pan-Celtic General Committee to organise periodic congresses, and to foster links amongst the Celtic peoples, seems to have come from Scotland and Wales. The Committee was to embrace the 6 Celtic nations: Scotland, Wales, Ireland, the Isle of Man, Cornwall and Brittany. The desire to include Brittany came from Geddes and Sharp. In 1899 the Irish Gaelic League was invited to affiliate itself to the organisation.

This invitation came at an important time for the Gaelic League, when it was facing up to the choice of identifying itself totally with Catholicism and nationalism, or maintaining a non-party stance and keeping up the adherence and enthusiasm of its few but important Protestants and northerners. Obviously a decision to join the Pan-Celtic alliance would have pushed it towards the latter course by linking it with non-Catholic and non-Irish movements. The Pan-Celts' invitation forced the leaders of the League into analysing their own aims.

In fact, the League decided not to join the Pan-Celtic movement. The attitude of Fiona Macleod was probably one of the reasons for this decision. It was also true that the movement, which contained more than its fair share of eccentrics, had something of the air of the lunatic fringe to it; Father Peter O'Leary of the Irish Gaelic League referred to it as "the Pan-Celtic humbug". The Gaelic League decided to align itself firmly with Irish national aspirations alone. As John Hogan wrote to Eoin MacNeill:

> We do not speak the same national language, we do not belong to the same church, at no period of history, as far as I know, (Scotland excepted) did we form one nation or speak a common language. There is no such language as 'Celtic' and there is no such country as 'Celtia' but there is an Irish language and a country called Eire. Let not the issue of this struggle of ours be confounded. Irish nationality is the motive power, our people will never rise to a Celtic movement, individuals may, and if we draw the herring of Celticism across the path, our movement will lose the only force that can bring success.

Of the leaders of the League, only Douglas Hyde was enthusiastic. He, of course, was a Protestant, and, as we

have seen, was also a friend of Sharp's. He wanted to join the Pan-Celtic General Committee. Had he done so, his status as President of the Irish Gaelic League would have been a tremendous encouragement to the Pan-Celtic movement. But Hyde was dissuaded by his more nationalist friends, and the Gaelic League confined themselves to "festive interchange of greetings" with the Pan-Celts (42).

Sharp joined the alliance - twice, once as himself and once as Fiona Macleod. Despite the rebuff, the decision was taken to hold the first Congress in Dublin in August 1901. There was obviously some Irish support, and the President for the Congress was an Irish peer, Lord Castletown. Castletown was not, however, the sort of person to appeal to the enthusiasts for Irish nationalism in the Gaelic League. Not only was he a Protestant and a landlord, he was also an ex army officer and Conservative M.P. Sharp did not attend the conference as, according to his wife, he felt his presence there might lead to his detection as Fiona Macleod (43). The proceedings were reported in the Scottish nationalist paper The Fiery Cross:

> It was not in any sense political, but linguistic and national. Its main object was to bring the members of the various branches of the Celtic race into friendly inter-communication, and to resolve upon certain questions of language and custom etc (44).

Two further Pan-Celtic Congresses were held: in Caernarvon in 1904, and Edinburgh in 1908. The advanced Irish continued to avoid them. When a correspondent enquired of the United Irishman why the paper had ignored the second Congress, he

received the reply that for the moment Scotland and Wales were "with the enemy", happy accepters of English rule and the Empire. The Congress, said the United Irishman was useless precisely because it was non-political (45).

The next Fiona Macleod work to appear after The Divine Adventure was "The Gael and his Heritage", an article in The Nineteenth Century for November 1900. It was inspired by the publication of a collection of Scots Gaelic hymns and incantations in translation. For Sharp it was another opportunity to lament the downfall of the Gael.

> Even in the Gaelic-speaking Irish west, from Donegal to Clare, the native collector finds more and more difficulty; for the old are proud, and the middle-aged have forgotten or are silent, and the young do not know and do not care. Dr. Douglas Hyde, the late William Larminie and others have done what they could, but the gleaners now have a small aftermath for their gain, because of the narrowing pastures of a once vast and fruitful national heritage.... By a singular irony the students of Gaelic literature and Gaelic language are increasing.... Soon there will be only a few old peasants and a few learned men (mostly German) who will be able to speak in the old language (46).

And, in an appreciative study of his friend Yeats' The Shadowy Waters (1900), he returned to the attack against unreasoning Irish nationalism.

> There are, of course, faults on both sides.... If on the one side there has been, and still is, obtuseness (to speak of a sullen ill-will on the part of England towards Gaelic Ireland and Gaelic Scotland is now untrue), there is on the other a worse quality than obtuseness, a cultivated hate. It is almost inconceivable to what lengths this cult of revenge or hatred, this blind irreconcilability, will go (47).

As well as writing warmly of The Shadowy Waters, Sharp dedicated his own book of Fiona Macleod poems, The Foam of

the Past, to Yeats. Despite what differences they may have had, Sharp believed that he and Yeats were seeking the same artistic goals, and said so in a typical piece of Fiona Macleod whimsy.

> I think I may call you friend, for we go one way, the dearer that it is narrow and little trod and leads by the whispering sedge and the wilderness, and meet sometimes on that way, and know that we seek the same Graal, and shall come upon it, beyond that fathomless hollow of green water that lies in the West as our poets say, the 'Pool' whose breath is Silence and over which hangs a bow of red flame whitening to its moon-white core (48).

Notwithstanding the dedication, Yeats was not enthusiastic about Fiona Macleod's poetry. He wrote to "her" in November 1901 that "though now and then a bit of verse comes well, I never like your poetry as well as your prose". As has been mentioned, he had his reservations about the prose too, and said in the same letter: "You, as I think, should seek the delights of style in utter simplicity, in a self-effacing rhythm and language; in an expression that is like a tumbler of water rather than like a cup of wine". He was generous in ascribing the faults to an excess of imagination, and remarked that his Irish audience would not stand for too much undisciplined fancy.

> To some extent I have an advantage over you in having a very fierce nation to write for. I have to make everything very hard and clear, as it were. It is like riding a wild horse. If one's hands fumble or one's knees loosen one is thrown. You have in the proper sense far more imagination than I have and that makes your work correspondingly more difficult. It is fairly easy for me, who do so much of my work by the critical, rather than the imaginative faculty, to be precise and simple, but it is hard for you in whose mind images form themselves without ceasing and are gone as quickly perhaps (49).

In February 1903 Sharp was writing on another friend, Lady Gregory. An article in the Fortnightly Review discussed her dramatic work and the poetry of Ethna Carberry. Despite the latter's strongly nationalist sympathies, Sharp preferred her poetry to Lady Gregory's work. He admitted that Lady Gregory's was probably better literature, but found it lacking in what he admired most of all in Celtic writing, feeling and passion:

> ... over scholarly in its unwavering need to be consciously the thing it sets out to be: over cold in its strange sameness of emotion: a little chill with the chill of studious handicraft.... In a word, it seems to me that the literary flaw in Lady Gregory's version (of a play) is its monotonous passionlessness (50).

The review also contained another long passage of lament for the passing of the Celt, but it would be wearisome to reproduce it. Though his tribute to Lady Gregory's work was thus a very limited one, Sharp felt it on reflection to have been too generous. A year later he wrote to the folklorist Alfred Nutt:

> ... I did take up the book and re-read it. I must admit that, reading critically, I was somewhat disillusioned, and in more ways than one. The subject and the attempt had both so won my sympathy, and Mr. Yeats' extraordinarily high claims had so prejudiced me, that I came to the book while the rainbow was on it. In certain respects it is a fine and notable achievement, but it is not nearly so 'original' as I thought it - I mean, in the sense that far more of the book is 'lifted', as you say, than I had at first noticed. And more than ever I realised how often the old is weakened in the retelling (51).

In 1904 Sharp wrote, as Fiona Macleod, a "Prelude" to a book called The Winged Destiny. In it, he reflected on Celtic. It was one of the last things he wrote and, since

it contained his last thoughts on his most controversial piece, is a good place to close the examination of Fiona Macleod/William Sharp.

He admitted that Celtic had not gone down well in Ireland. Indeed, not only had it been a "signal for divided comment" there, it had been "execrated" by some "of those deservedly held in honour" in that country. Sharp, as we have seen, had always maintained that he wrote only from the standpoint of the Highlander. Now he admitted that the essay had had a political object: that it was "intended" for the "more eager spirits" of Irish nationalism. He claimed that he was not irreconcilably opposed to nationalism as such, but in Celtic was calling for "a workable reconciliation". Nonetheless, he reaffirmed that he believed "that the dream of an outward independence is a perilous illusion".

Sharp dealt at length with the sentence in Celtic in which he had said: "It is obvious that if one would write English literature, one must write in English and in the English tradition". He accused his critics of misrepresenting him in taking this to mean that all literature must be essentially English, but admitted that the use of the word "must" at all was unfortunate. He went on to point out that the English language and its literature "is not the exclusive property of that section of our complex race which is distinctively English".

> In a very true sense, therefore, there can be an Irish literature, a Scottish literature, an Anglo-Gaelic literature, as well as an English literature; but in the wider sense it is all English literature ...

All the British nations shared "a common bond and a common destiny". In what was perhaps his strongest argument, he instanced Yeats and AE as writers who produced poetry that was both Celtic and English at the same time (52).

Sharp died the next year, 1905, in Sicily, and his identity as Fiona Macleod was immediately disclosed. The disclosure caused a minor sensation, testimony to the popularity of the Fiona Macleod books. Sharp had produced a sizeable body of work in the 12 years of writing as Fiona Macleod. Of necessity, this discussion has concentrated on only one aspect of that work, which naturally produces an imbalanced picture of it. Fiona Macleod is not easy to read nowadays, and the style, as Yeats pointed out, is frequently irritatingly whimsical and self-conscious. The piling up of adjectives and the oblique method of reaching every point make the books turgid to read, and often call for a considerable degree of patience and perspicacity.

Serious students of Celtic literature and language in Scotland have little time for Fiona Macleod. Sharp had no Gaelic and only a traveller's acquaintance with the Highlands. This dismissal of Fiona Macleod by scholars, and the unreadibility of the Fiona Macleod books, has obscured their considerable impact at the time. There were a few genuine scholars working on Gaelic tales in the Highlands at the end of the nineteenth century: Alexander Carmichael was one. But their work never had the popular success of Fiona Macleod. For most readers, Fiona Macleod was the Highlands,

as Barrie, Crockett and MacLaren were the Lowlands. The fact that the Fiona Macleod books presented the Highlander as fanciful, vague, charming and uninterested in nationalism increased their acceptance.

It could be argued that those in Ireland like Hyde and Yeats, with a genuine and deep knowledge of the Celtic past, should have rejected Fiona Macleod. It was not surprising that popular opinion, which heard so much of a Celtic Renaissance coming out of Ireland, identified Fiona Macleod with it. If Celtic Renaissance was in the air, then clearly these books were part of it. But it is perhaps fair to say that a man like Hyde could have identified Fiona Macleod as not being the genuine article.

The Irish, in fact, rejected Fiona Macleod for the wrong reasons. For, having accepted her as part of their movement, a thing Sharp never asked them to do, they then turned on her for betraying its aspirations. To Sharp, literature had no aspirations except that it should be good art. Though he was almost subservient to Yeats on matters of style and presentation, he yielded to no pressure from anyone on this fundamental point. When Sharp came to write the Fiona Macleod books, he already had an established position as poet and critic. He wrote them because he loved the Highlands, because he wanted to write about the Highlands, and because they were popular. In a sense, the philosophy of Fiona Macleod was that she had no philosophy. When hostile pressure made this stance untenable, then

Sharp, the liberal cosmopolitan, expounded his belief in reconciliation and a British ideal and future. This was a future in which the Celt had a part to play, but would only be a part. Sharp wandered into a debate of which he had no knowledge, and in which he had no desire to participate. Finding himself involved, he set out his position and stuck to it. He was not prepared to revise his beliefs because he was supposed to be part of a Celtic Renaissance whose exponents disagreed with him.

For a last word on Fiona Macleod, it is worth quoting J. H. Millar, a contemporary Scottish literary historian. Millar was a sharp and shrewd critic, who tempered his observations with a good sense of humour. He wrote:

> These volumes are destitute neither of charm nor merit; but, if they represent the Celt of the Western Islands as endowed with the imagination and the feelings of a poet, they also portray him as a maudlin and inefficient nincompoop (53).

CHAPTER 9: STEVENSON, HENLEY AND THE SCOTS OBSERVER

> He detested Mr. Gladstone, I am pleased to say; but his gift of self-persuasion was scarce second to that statesman's own.
>
> W. E. Henley reflecting on Robert Louis Stevenson

William Sharp was a very unpolitical writer. Initially, it never occurred to him that the ideas he was expressing in the Fiona Macleod books were politically sensitive. It was only when they were attacked on that basis, that he came forward to elucidate and support his belief in the divisiveness of nationalism. The 2 authors discussed in this chapter, on the other hand, were both instinctively and passionately political.

William Ernest Henley was famous for the strength of his political partisanship, he was a fervent Tory, and for the rumbustious delight in controversy that he brought to it. With Stevenson, Scotland's foremost writer of the late nineteenth century, the depth of his political commitment, he too was a Tory, is at first sight much less evident. Little that he wrote was overtly political and his day to day interest in politics, as revealed for example in his letters, emerges as sporadic and hazy. Acquaintance with every issue, however, has never been a prerequisite of strong opinions, and Stevenson's Toryism, of the romantic and traditional type, suffused all his life and writings. Though often a very democratic man in his personal relationships, he favoured a hierarchical and structured form of society. Such a society he believed the Highlands before

the Forty-Five to have been, and he was to find for himself at the end of his life in Samoa, where he delighted in playing the feudal lord. Once established there in the early 1890s, he was to take a keen interest in the complex national and international manoeuverings that constituted Samoan politics. Not only an interest, for Stevenson also became personally involved in Samoan politics in a small way: he had found a cause to get embroiled in as the letters on the subject with which he bombarded The Times showed. Ireland in the 1880s was to be one of the false starts in that search for a cause.

Stevenson and Henley met in Edinburgh in 1875. Both were in their 20s and looking to a life of writing. Their backgrounds, however, were very different. Through the sheer volume of the studies of Stevenson's early years, his has become established as the archetypal example of a prosperous middle-class Edinburgh upbringing. The Georgian house in the New Town, the devoted nurse, the kind but sternly Calvinist father, the study of law at Edinburgh University: Stevenson's life up to this time has become a classic portrait of mid-Victorian bourgeois Edinburgh. He was in the process of breaking out of this most formidable of moulds and was busily engaged in essay-writing when he was taken to Edinburgh's Royal Infirmary by Leslie Stephen to meet another young author: W. E. Henley.

Henley suffered from a tubercular infection in his legs, and had already had one amputated. He had come to Edinburgh

to put himself in the hands of the great surgeon Lister, and Lister's skill, combined with Henley's immense courage and patience, eventually averted the amputation of his other leg. He was to spend 2 years in all in the Royal Infirmary, and Edinburgh was to give Henley much. In the words of his biographer: "He was to find there as much health as he would ever have, his wife, work, friends and companions, and the chance to fulfil his dreams and his desires" (1). The closest of these friends for many years was Stevenson. Henley came from Gloucester and was the son of a bookseller. His early life had been marred by neglect and poverty, bookselling being a notoriously penurious occupation, as well as ill-health. For all that, his character exuded ebullience, enthusiasm, a fierce desire to succeed in his chosen profession and a delight in conversation and robust opinions. All these attributes he shared with Stevenson, and the 2 seem to have got on well from the first.

The tangible result of their friendship was a series of 4 never very successful jointly written plays, the first of which, Deacon Brodie, appeared in 1880. Their independent careers were much more prosperous and productive than these rather mannered plays. Henley became a powerful and artistically, if not always financially, successful editor, running London (1876-79) and the Magazine of Art (1881-86). Stevenson quickly established a reputation, publishing 5 books of travel and essays from 1878 to 1882. The next year he published his first full length novel, the brilliant Treasure Island, which included a delightful if mischievous portrait of his friend Henley as Long John Silver.

In August of the year before (1882) he had published a book called New Arabian Nights. It consisted of a series of artificial, light and amusing stories centred round an idealised figure: Prince Florizel of Bohemia. The sketches had originally been written in 1878 for Henley's London. Though somewhat convoluted and failing to be convincing as either fantasy or realism, the book enjoyed a moderate success.

The following year his wife Fanny made up a series of tales around the Irish-American dynamiters whose activities in London and elsewhere were exciting public attention. The Stevensons wrote up the stories and published them at the beginning of 1885. The book appeared under their joint names with the title More New Arabian Nights. In subsequent editions the title was changed to The Dynamiter.

The Dynamiter has some amusing incidents but is in general a rather heavy-handed and uninspired work. Most critics have put the blame for this on Fanny, who wrote the bulk of it. Stevenson himself contributed one story, the introduction and the epilogue. These last centre on Prince Florizel, now fallen on hard times and running a tobacconist shop under the name Goodall: Florizel's presence providing continuity from New Arabian Nights. The book narrates how 3 idle and romantic young men are fooled into unwittingly helping the dynamiters. Much time is spent on the highly improbable tales the female confederates of the dynamiters tell the young men to convince them that they need their

help. The tone is artificial and light-hearted and much amusement is had at the expense of the chivalrous and dull-witted young Englishmen. The dynamiters appear as charming and intelligent.

The balance is redressed and the seriousness of the subject stressed in the passages by Stevenson. The book is prefaced by a dedication to 2 policemen, Cole and Cox, who are praised for an act of bravery against real dynamiters. Parnell is attacked, "horror is due" to him and he is unquestioningly linked with the dynamite campaign. The book is dedicated to the policemen not as upholders of legitimate government but as defenders of " ... the child, the breeding woman, of individual pity and public trust". Stevenson is even prepared to admit that all may not be well with Irish government: he writes that it is difficult to determine "whoever be in the right in this great and confused war of politics". He reiterates his position in the epilogue. Florizel-Goodall is here lecturing the girl dynamiter on the evils of dynamitism. She remarks that coming from a royal family it is unlikely that he should ever have felt strongly about oppression; and he replies that everyone, by the fact of their birth, should be united against action which is indiscriminately injuring women and children.

In "The Tale of the Exploding Bomb" Stevenson pursues his intention of making dynamitism look ridiculous, since he doubted his ability to make it sufficiently horrible to

satisfy himself. It concerns the agent Zero, who is ridiculous because his bombs do not work but who is also contemptible. He is personally a coward and he is quite uncaring about the destruction he might cause. He relates with pride his only success in which a barrow, some copies of a newspaper, and a small child were slightly injured. His colleague McGuire is so reduced to terror by being unable to plant a bomb he is carrying that he tries to unload it onto a small girl. McGuire later dies "of fear". Zero himself is finally blown to bits by his only successful "infernal machine", after declaring that it would be grossly criminal to denounce him and turn him over to the mercy of a mob.

Stevenson's ferocious satire sits somewhat uneasily among the solid pleasantries of the rest of the book. Its impact is further lessened by a far from satisfactory happy ending that the tone of the rest demanded. It is hard to agree with the contemporary reviewer in The Times that Stevenson had written "with extraordinary skill and with a grim humour befitting the gravity of his subject" (2). As a work of art, Quiller-Couch's novel on the same theme published 3 years later, The History of Troy Town, is infinitely more appealing. In a "Prefatory Note" added to an edition long after her husband's death, Fanny recalled that "The Dynamiter did double service: first, as an amusement for my husband during the tedious hours of his illness in 1883; and afterwards as a means of replenishing our depleted bank account" (3). The implication of this is that Stevenson

did not take the book very seriously; probably in artistic terms he did not, and rightly.

But, having made the decision to make something out of Fanny's stories, he certainly took the opportunity to denounce dynamitism very seriously. The fact that he did not choose a very suitable medium to do so should not obscure the earnestness of his intent. Dynamitism deeply offended both his conservative view of society and his abiding respect for human life, as he had shown in a passionate letter to Sidney Colvin in 1881:

> I am in a mad fury about these explosions. If that is the new world! Damn O'Donovan Rossa; damn him behind and before, above, below and round-about; damn, deracinate and destroy him, root and branch, self and company, world without end. Amen. I wrote that for sport if you like, but I will pray in earnest: O Lord, if you cannot convert, kindly delete him! (4).

The Dynamiter was published at the beginning of 1885. Towards the end of that year occurred an event in Ireland that was to fascinate Stevenson. The Times of November 15 carried a report from a correspondent in Cork: "Murder by Moonlighters". It described an attack on the home of John O'Connell Curtin, "a gentleman farmer", near Tralee in Co. Kerry. A group of young men had come to the house demanding the shotguns that Curtin and his sons kept for wildfowling. They occupied the kitchen, holding his wife and daughters while they instructed his sons to fetch the guns. Hearing the disturbance, Curtin came downstairs with a pistol he kept in his bedroom and shot one of the raiders, a local man called Sullivan who died later. The rest retreated

from the kitchen in some disarray whereupon Curtin and his sons gave chase. Curtin was shot in the kitchen doorway and, like Sullivan, died later in the evening.

The next day 9 local men were arrested, and 2 of them were brought before the magistrates on suspicion of murder on the 17th. The others were released but these 2, Timothy Casey and Daniel Daly, were sent for trial at Cork Assizes. The charge was murder and local feeling was obviously already running in their favour, as both the courtroom and the curtins' house were surrounded by large forces of police. The "outrage" was being made much of in the press of Britain and Ireland. The Times of November 24 carried the following announcement:

> We are asked to publish the following: 'Mrs. Curtin desires to return her most grateful and heartfelt thanks to the many friends and sympathisers both in England and Ireland, who have so kindly condoled with her and her afflicted family in their recent sad bereavement. She trusts they will acept this in lieu of more formal acknowledgements, as the whole family have been so utterly prostrated by the awful calamity which has befallen them that such is rendered impossible'.

Considering the amount of agrarian crime in Ireland at the time, it is perhaps surprising that this case should excite so much attention. Curtin was, however, an unusual victim. He was a Catholic and, as his middle name indicates, from a nationalist family. Moreover, he was President of the area National League. He thus made an ideal victim for the Unionist press to play up. He was a more sympathetic character than the agents and process-servers who made up the usual victims of agrarian violence, and provided a good

example of the arbitrary nature of such violence. In addition, the case was one which caused considerable embarrassment to the Nationalists, particularly as it came during an election campaign.

Casey and Daly came up for trial in Cork on December 22nd. An announcement from the Attorney-General a week before had said that the murder charge would be dropped in favour of the lesser charge of forming part of the attack. Presumably, considering the confusion of the whole episode, it had proved impossible to obtain any evidence that either of them had actually fired the shot which killed Curtin. The judge, Mr. Justice William O'Brien, obviously felt that they were at least morally responsible for the murder, for he gave them 14 years each for "unlawfully assaulting Curtin's dwelling and injuring his property". They had both pleaded not guilty but it took the jury only 20 minutes to convict them and the whole case was completed in one day.

Angered by the severity of the sentences, local opinion turned further against the Curtin family. It was felt to be unjust that no mention had been made of the fact that Curtin himself had fired the first fatal shot. From the beginning of 1886 the family were boycotted. This was a further embarrassment to the National League who held that this weapon should be used only against enemies of Ireland. They felt that this was merely a local dispute. They also foresaw, correctly, that it would provide more good copy for the Unionist press: not only had the Irish murdered a

local nationalist leader but they were now isolating his family. The National League sent their greatest and most popular leader, Michael Davitt, to condemn the boycott. Davitt denounced the raid on Curtin's house as a "senseless and criminal proceeding of contemptible burglars and cut-purses masquerading as patriots", but his appeal to lift the boycott had no effect (5).

By the spring of 1887 the Curtins had been boycotted for over a year. Mrs. Curtin had attempted to sell the lease of the farm but had, not surprisingly, found no takers. At this point Stevenson, who had closely followed the case as it had been lovingly reported in The Times, determined to get involved. He worked out a scheme whereby he and his family would go over to Ireland, rent the farm from the Curtins and move in with them. He believed that the presence of a well-known writer would focus the attention of the world on the case and show decisively the terrible nature of Irish violence. He thought he might easily be murdered and that that would prove even more effective, and declared that he was prepared to die to make his point.

His thoughts on the idea are set out at length in a letter to his friend Mrs. Fleeming Jenkin, whose husband's biography he was then writing. He listed 5 reasons why he should go: he could work anywhere, his death would cause a great stir, he was particularly well-known in America and might therefore influence American opinion to stop supporting Irish violence, nobody else was taking up the task, and

his life was so uncertain physically that he could die soon anyway. Against these he discussed the objections: his family would not like it there, he would probably dislike it himself when he got there, he could achieve nothing and might well be animated just by dreams of glory. He was honest enough to observe that he was more likely to be killed by the Irish climate than an Irish bullet.

In a revealing passage at the end of the letter he wrote:

> I do not love this health-tending housekeeping life of mine. I have a taste for danger, which is human, like the fear of it. Here is a fair cause; a just cause; no knight ever set lance in rest for juster. Yet it needs not the strength I have not, only the passive courage that I hope I could muster and the watchfulness that I am sure I could learn (6).

Stevenson's scheme came to nothing. His family were understandably reluctant, though Fanny loyally agreed to accompany him if his heart were set on it. In the event, Stevenson heard that his father was dying and hurried back to Edinburgh to be with him. The Irish idea was then quietly dropped.

The evidence on this extraordinary episode is sketchy, but it does seem clear that, fantastic as his scheme was, Stevenson was completely in earnest. Undoubtedly, much of the impetus for it came from restlessness and simple boredom with "this health-tending, housekeeping life of mine". It combined with the attractive image of the knight-errant that so appealed to the romantic Tory in Stevenson. Oddly, for a man who was usually very alive to absurdity in himself or others, the comic side of his vision does not seem to

have struck him. As one of his biographers wrote, had he gone he would almost certainly "have provoked nothing deadlier than derision" (7). The explanation must lie in the very genuine passion that the whole sorry episode of the Curtins roused in him. It was the same passion that had before also resulted in the temporary suspension of his humour and critical faculties when he wrote his sections of The Dynamiter.

For, in a postscript to the letter to Mrs. Fleeming Jenkin, he had written that he wished above all to support:

> the cause of decency, the idea that populations should not be taught to gain public ends by private crime, the idea that for all men to bow before a threat of crime is to loosen and degrade beyond redemption the whole fabric of man's decency.

This was the precise line taken in The Dynamiter. It raises the further question of Stevenson's approach to and use of Ireland. In the letter to Mrs. Fleeming Jenkin he specifically repudiated the idea that he would be going to Ireland to support the cause of Unionism as such. As with The Dynamiter, it was the battle against anarchism and anarchy that was important. His knowledge of Irish affairs was not profound and he seems never to have realised the exceptional nature of the Curtin affair in terms of the Irish land war. The Times may have had its own reasons for particularly featuring this case, but Stevenson did not pick up on them and saw it as purely an outrageous example of injustice and tyranny. It was through the prominence the case achieved, but not because of the reasons for that prominence, that Stevenson discovered it and followed it.

As a Unionist and through his abhorrence of dynamitism, Stevenson was already predisposed to a hostile view of Ireland. This view was strengthened by the conversion of Gladstone, a politician whom he believed was deliberately tortuous of mind and lacking in principle, to Home Rule, and was confirmed by the Curtin affair. To some degree, his suspicion of the Irish may have been based on his decidedly low opinion of the Irish immigrants to his native city, as 2 quotations from his book Edinburgh, Picturesque Notes (1879) illustrate:

> The local antiquary points out where famous and well-born people had their lodging; and as you look up, out pops the head of a slatternly woman from the countess' window. The Bedouins camp within Pharaoh's palace walls, and the old war-ship is given over to the rats. We are already a far way from the days when powdered heads were plentiful in these alleys, with jolly, port-wine faces underneath. Even in the chief thoroughfares Irish washings flutter at the windows and the pavements are encumbered with loiterers.
>
> The daylight shines garishly on the back windows of the Irish quarter; on broken shutters, wry gables, old palsied houses on the brink of ruin, a crumbling pigsty fit for human pigs. There are few signs of life, besides a scanty washing or a face at a window; the dwellers are abroad, but they will return at night and stagger to their pallets (8).

That may not have been a sympathetic portrait, but it was a vivid one and one obviously based on his own impressions gained from a close acquaintance with Edinburgh. It is certainly a great deal more convincing than any of the other Irish references or figures in the rest of his work. His most important Irish character was the Chevalier Burke in The Master of Ballantrae: a shallow and Leverite figure whose very name was perhaps inspired by Lever's Tom Burke

of Ours. Elsewhere, he had 2 minor Irish characters in his Pacific story The Wrecker, and a brief appearance of Burke and Hare in his ghost story The Body-Snatcher: "ruffians" with a "hangdog, abominable" look. A good case could be made for Kidnapped, one of his finest novels, being based on an incident from the Annesley trials, an important cause célèbre of eighteenth century Ireland. But here the reference is more likely to have come from Smollett's Peregrine Pickle, a contemporary Scottish work based on the case, than from any study of the original events.

While Stevenson's knowledge of Ireland and the Irish was not wide, the evidence of The Dynamiter and the Curtin episode certainly show that he felt deeply about them in the 1880s. His continuing friendship with Henley could only have strengthened this preoccupation with, and suspicion of, Ireland. Henley was still primarily an art and literary critic in the mid-1880s, but he had also procured a reputation for formidable and ferocious political journalism. A keen Tory and imperialist, his aversion for Gladstone and Liberalism was buttressed by the decision to promote Irish Home Rule, a decision Henley believed was based on Gladstone's cowardice in refusing to continue to combat Irish lawlessness and separatism. From December 1888 Henley was to be given the opportunity to expound his views on Irish policy through his editorship of the newly-founded Scots Observer.

By the time he came to Edinburgh to take charge of this periodical his friendship with Stevenson had been broken.

In March 1888 he wrote to Stevenson pointing out that he believed that a story Fanny had just published was plagiarised, without acknowledgement, from a mutual friend. Stevenson, who was always sensitive to criticism of Fanny and who believed rightly that Henley had never taken to her, replied with a cold denial. The correspondence thus engendered became both lengthy and increasingly bitter and brought about the end of their long and warm friendship (9). There were faults on both sides: Fanny was almost certainly in the wrong and Stevenson's proud refusal to even consider this possibility only goaded Henley into an ever increasing use of his impressive and irascible gift for controversy and inflicting personal hurt. It was a sad end to their relationship and Henley, who for all his faults could be both kind and generous, must have privately reflected sorrowfully on it as he came north to take on the Scots Observer.

The Scots Observer had been started by a group of youngish Tory Edinburgh friends. Firmly established in Edinburgh's middle-class, they felt the need for a quality but lively Unionist periodical. Having felt the need for such a paper, they set one up. Robert Fitzroy Bell put up most of the money, and continued to subsidise it for the whole of its existence. Walter Blaikie, a partner in T. and A. Constable, arranged for its printing. Blaikie, born in 1847, was a minister's son who had worked as an engineer in India before coming back to Edinburgh, and taking a job with Constables in 1879. He was made a partner after 6 months and remained active in the business until his death in 1928. He was

fascinated by book production and printing, and certainly the Observer was much more attractively produced than most late Victorian periodicals. His other passion was Jacobitism, in particular the Forty-Five. He was on the council of the Scottish History Society and published frequently in their Proceedings. He also wrote 3 books on the Forty-Five and built up a major collection of Jacobite pamphlets and broadsides, now in the National Library of Scotland.

The other members of the group were Charles Baxter, Stevenson's oldest friend and now a solicitor, and Robert Hamilton Bruce, who used his personal fortune from a family business to collect books and pictures omnivorously. James Nichol Dunn, a Scottish journalist trained in London, was established in Thistle Street in Edinburgh to edit the paper, and production began. After the first few numbers, it became clear that Dunn was not up to the task and Henley was drafted in.

The Scots Observer was a remarkable periodical. It was lively and amusing, certainly by the standards of its time; combative and entertaining: a world away from the stuffiness of the Edinburgh Review, for example. It was also aggressively Tory and Imperialist. It could be venomous, at times almost scurrilous. At the beginning of its second 6 month volume a note briefly set out its policy.

> As a Scots adventure it appeals to Scotsmen first of all; but it is nothing if not British - it is nothing if it does not maintain those Imperial principles whose observance has made Scotland a master factor in the sum of the world's history, and whose neglecting - as of late we have had occasion to see - may bring the

whole fabric of British unity to a miserable and untimely end (10).

It was very Scottish, at least during its first year and a half. This fact has often been overlooked or ignored by critics. Because it later changed its name to the National Observer and was edited from London, and because Henley was an English journalist, the Observer has been described only in terms of Henley's total output (11). Certainly it had English contributors, notably Henley's friend Charles Whibley who wrote most of the art criticism and many of the "Modern Men" series. But it had much detailed description of the Scottish political scene; particularly studies of individual constituencies and profiles of the Unionist members or hopeful candidates. As it said in its note on policy, it sought to be Scottish and then from that perspective to look out at Britain, the Empire and the World. Much of the material on the local background of Scottish politics probably came from Fitzroy Bell who was both an influential and informed figure in Scottish Unionist and university circles. Certainly the contributors must have included those who knew Scotland and Scottish politics a lot better than Henley could have done. As with most periodicals of the time, nearly all the articles were unsigned. Henley did, however, build up an impressive list of contributors whose work appeared with their names, including Yeats, Andrew Lang, Barrie and Stevenson, personal animosities being presumably in abeyance in the last case.

They also included the youthful Rudyard Kipling who first published his Barrack Room Ballads in the Observer. Another of his contributions was "Cleared", the furious and bitter long poem "In Memory of the Parnell Commission", which appeared on March 8 1890. The last verse gives some flavour of the whole:

> If black is black or white is white, in black and white it's down,
> You're only traitors to the Queen and rebels to the Crown.
> If print is print or words are words, the learned Court perpends:-
> We are not ruled by murderers, but only - by their friends.

This poem was allegedly rescued from Kipling's waste-paper basket by Fitzroy Bell when Bell visited him in London to meet their young contributor. Kipling recounted that it had been rejected by The Times and also by Frank Harris. It was not perhaps surprising that The Times had decided not to accept it, though they were more likely to have done so from a desire to forget the whole episode than from a feeling of becoming shame. Kipling humorously recalled that Henley "having no sense of political decency" published it and one can imagine that Kipling's impressive invective must have delighted Henley.

The Scottish critic J. H. Millar was in no doubt that Kipling and the Observer had played an important part in restoring Unionist morals by publishing "Cleared". As he wrote in a review of Kipling's work in 1898:

> No patriot assuredly can forget the signal service which he rendered to his country, at a moment when the horizon was darker than one now cares to think of, by the publication of 'Cleared'. It is not only one of

> the most trenchant pieces of rhetoric in any language (Juvenal himself might be proud to claim it for his own), but it furnishes an absolute and conclusive answer to the contemptible sophistries by which men who had once had at least a bowing acquaintance with honesty were fain to palliate their connection and co-operation with ruffians and assassins (12).

"Cleared" was certainly in keeping with the general tone of the paper, for the Observer's Toryism was not of the gentlemanly and retiring kind. It pitched into Gladstone with venom every week of its existence. The Liberals were invariably referred to as the "Separatists" and once as the "Party of Disintegration" (13). The only Liberal who ever received a kind word through 104 issues was Rosebery, who was allowed a little credit for his imperialism: though he was "overrated", he was "the only hope of the Gladstonians" for "in the kingdom of the blind the one-eyed man is King" (14). The paper also waxed exceedingly indignant at the rise of socialism. It reported strikes at length and without any charity for strikers. To report in 1889 "the tyranny of organised labour is becoming more and more rampant" smacked of paranoia. Equally to be abhorred was the rise of the new woman. In a blood-curdling article prompted by a small police mutiny in London, the writer declared that what was needed was firm dealing with new and dangerous ideas:

> Only there is a sort of person in authority who is never able to mark that line, and say 'No' resolutely when his school-boys or policemen or women-kind try to go over it (15).

Not surprisingly, Irish nationalism was roundly condemned. In format, the paper opened with a dozen or so short leaders,

encompassing the week's events in parliament and world affairs. These were followed by 3 or 4 longer leaders and then the main articles, sketches and poems, correspondence and finally some 6 pages of book reviews. Irish affairs always occupied at least 2 of the short leaders and usually one of the longer ones. The rank and file of the Irish parliamentary party was castigated for both foolishness and knavery. They were the begetters of disloyalty and crime, and "make up in adjectives what they lack in brains" (16). Inside the party, the Observer's particular dislikes were William O'Brien and, perhaps more surprisingly, Dr. Tanner. Tanner was described as a "Yahoo" and it was alleged to be difficult to imagine "a being whose conduct was more repugnant to decency and good taste" (17). O'Brien was habitually referred to as the "distroused one" and characterised as a malevolent buffoon.

> Irish patriots have been ridiculous enough before; but Mr. W. O'Brien is the first of them who has sought and found a leadership by deliberately rendering himself a laughing-stock unto men (18).

They never considered Parnell to be ridiculous; on the contrary he was portrayed as a sinister figure skilfully manipulating his Liberal allies. The proposal to grant him the freedom of Edinburgh not surprisingly drove the Observer to fury. It also aroused the wrath of The Scotsman and both papers ran a vigorous campaign against it for the best part of 3 months. The Scotsman fired the first shot, declaring that "the shamelessness of the proposal stirs every one who has the slightest regard for the dignity and

honour of the city". Its leader maintained that this would be the first time that the freedom of the city had ever been used as a purely political one-party honour. In any case, the Pigott forgeries had been only one small part of the case against Parnell; in effect he was still on trial for encouraging crime and it was unthinkable to move in the matter until the Commission was concluded and had reported. Edinburgh, the paper reminded its readers occupied a unique national position:

> The mere proposal is a wrong to the citizens of Edinburgh; but it is more, for Edinburgh cannot be regarded as an isolated town. In such a matter as this, Edinburgh would seem to speak with the voice of Scotland (19).

The Observer was the first to claim that the decision to honour Parnell had been taken in London, and that Edinburgh's Liberals were disgracing themselves, their city and their country by obediently doing as they were told in "a bit of paper signed 'Schnadhorst'" (20). This phrase became the motif of their articles on the event. On the day the Observer produced this theory, nicely calculated to appeal to Scottish national feeling, The Scotsman printed a detailed and hostile review of Parnell's career which ended:

> Is this the kind of man whom the citizens of Edinburgh are prepared to put on their honorary burgess roll in the future? If so, then the sun of Modern Athens has set, and the days of its honour and glory have departed.

Edinburgh's Unionists had been busy meanwhile. They decided to hold an informal plebiscite on the issue and sent out cards to all municipal electors, who were asked to indicate their views and return them to their "Citizens Committee".

The result was given full coverage in The Scotsman. About half of the electors returned the cards and 17,808 voted no to 3,197 voting yes. The leader writer was exultant: "The ratepayers of Edinburgh have done their duty" (21). The Liberals, on the other hand, pointed out that they had instructed people not to fill in or return the cards at all and that they had therefore a clear majority of the city in favour of the proposal. The Scotsman now decided to follow the Observer in indulging in a little Scottish nationalism and describing Schnadhorst as "the hand that pulled the wires that set the puppets dancing in our own Town Council". Citizens must ask themselves "whether we in Edinburgh are willing to have important functions of our Town Council exercised under dictation from a political manager in London" (22).

By the end of May it became clear to both papers that they had lost the battle: the Council had held 4 separate votes on the question, all of which had come out in favour of inviting Parnell, the invitation had been issued and Parnell had accepted. They consoled themselves by printing regular articles "illustrative" of Parnell's career. These, they claimed, should prove most valuable material for the Liberals in preparing their speeches of welcome when Parnell arrived. The Observer, not surprisingly, proved more effective in producing lively and venomous satire than its more staid ally. Parnell was referred to as

> a gentleman of Irish-American extraction whose chief claim upon (Liberal) loyalty appears to be that his name was forged by a person once in his pay (23).

It also published an unpleasantly snobbish short story in which a man who was uncomfortable because he had no idea how to behave at a political reception turns out to be an ex-waiter who has become an Irish M.P. The story was entitled: "The Freedom of Edinburgh to Follow" (24). Such was the supremacy of the Observer in this field that The Scotsman concluded its remarks on the subject the day after Parnell arrived by reprinting a particularly juicy paragraph from the Observer (25).

Given that the campaign to stop Parnell receiving the freedom of the city was doomed from the start, the Scots Observer had handled it with skill and splendidly unscrupulous verve. With the paper's hatred of Irish nationalism, it is also no surprise to discover that it had the highest regard for A. J. Balfour and his Irish policy. By the beginning of 1890 it was making the most extravagant claims for the success of his government of Ireland, a great deal more extravagant than anything Balfour was claiming himself.

> The country has not been so tranquil for years, crime has been enormously diminished, confidence has been in a large measure restored, and a period of unprecedented material prosperity seems to have set in.

It was indeed "Mr. Balfour's triumph" (26). They also delighted in his laconic style of dealing with Irish criticism: "his light-handed and scathingly sarcastic treatment of his vituperative victims is the redeeming delight of the Home Rule controversy" (27).

The Balfour Demonstration received heavy coverage: it was everything that the Parnell freedom had not been.

> The Demonstration to be held in Edinburgh next month in honour of the Irish Secretary is probably the most important political event in Scotland since the notorious Mid-Lothian Campaign. It is fitting that Mr. Balfour's countrymen should unite ... to show how well they recognise his unflinching courage, his inexhaustible fertility of resource, his brilliant and serene intelligence, and - above all - his unalterable regard for law and order (28).

After the event those who attended the banquet were described as "the very pick of Scotland"; reasonably enough since they included 2, or 3, of the paper's ruling group (29). To the mass meeting Balfour had made his best "fighting speech" and

> The spectacle presented by the Waverley Market on that occasion will not readily be forgotten by those who were present. The enormous building was crammed with eager listeners, who were quick at seizing on the speaker's points, and who gave the Irish Secretary a reception which may possibly have been equalled but can never have been excelled for warmth and enthusiasm (30).

Not only did the Scots Observer support Balfour, it frequently took a Blafourian line on Ireland. In its more sober moments, it keenly supported land purchase in Ireland. It ran a series of articles on the advantages of land purchase. They were not at all in its usual aggressive style, being rather defensive and admitting that many Unionists had strong reservations. To demonstrate this last point they received and published 2 long articles against any land purchase scheme by Frederick Greenwood. Greenwood was a leading Conservative journalist and editor of the St. James Gazette; he had been editor of the Pall Mall Gazette until it had acquired a new and Liberal proprietor.

The Liberal Unionist M.P., T. W. Russell, wrote a lengthy letter defending the notion of land purchase against Greenwood's strictures. The Observer had always been an admirer of Russell: several leaders praising his vision and skill had appeared. He was now given the chance to send in signed contributions on the Irish question. The first of these, not unnaturally, was again extolling land purchase. In later issues he turned to the question of boycotting. He described the troubles and courage of an Aberdonian farm manager in Co. Cork who was boycotted because his employer took up a vacant farm. Russell then established a committee to raise subscriptions to help a group of people boycotted in Tipperary (31).

In the Observer's less sober vein was an article on Irish national characteristics. It too enthusiastically supported Balfour's view that the Irish were an inferior race to whom it would be unwise to give a parliament. Politically, the Irish were "dour, dishonest, dishumoured" and "incapable of self-government, incapable of civic purity" and "incapable of refusing a bribe". They were congenitally careless of life and property, but it had to be admitted that the peasantry were welcoming and friendly to strangers in their "tumble-down huts where the pig and his equals abide in harmonious intimacy" (32). Even Balfour publicly kept his Anglo-Saxonism in check more than that.

The Scots Observer was as fierce in its literary comment as its political. It ran every week a profile of a well-known

person under the heading "Modern Men". Some of these were political: Henley, for example, wrote a laudatory one on Balfour. But the majority were figures from the arts, and few of them can have been grateful for the attention they received. F. J. Furnivall, the Shakespearian scholar was so upset by the review of his career and achievements that he wrote a brief letter accusing the author of the piece of being "a furiously and pervertedly mean-souled cad" and "the champion skunk of Scotland". The professor of Arabic at Cambridge, Robertson Smith, threatened legal action when he was accused of being a heretic who was a disgrace to his native city, Aberdeen. The paper took an especial delight in decrying Ouida and William Sharp. In a review of Sharp's admittedly uninspiring book on Robert Browning there appeared a delightful pastiche of his peculiar mode of writing:

> And Mr. Sharp's style! Is it not all his own? Is it not winsome as ever was a phalanx, vibrating as ever was a hiss, seductive as was ever summer lightning? How it stirs one's atom-pulse! It is as fascinating as the deceptive silhouette of a soul-star (33).

Hamilton Bruce stirred up a major controversy when he accused Ruskin of dishonesty in authorising a new edition of his Modern Painters. Bruce owned the edition of 1873 which promised to be the last full edition in the author's lifetime. Ruskin being himself beyond embarking on any new battles by this time, his friend the novelist W. G. Collingwood tried to defend the issuing of the new edition in a series of long, but not very impressive, letters. Ruskin was probably at fault, but he was old and ill and

possibly short of money, and no-one came out of the dispute particularly well. But the vigorous attack on the elder statesman of the art world caused a minor sensation.

In taking on Oscar Wilde, the Observer had at least found an adversary well able to look after himself and used to controversy. A review of the Picture of Dorian Gray, while admitting that it was well written, accused the novel of being "false to morality" and "discreditable" because the author seemed to "prefer a course of unnatural iniquity to a life of cleanliness, health and sanity". Wilde replied at length, pointing out reasonably enough that the reviewer had committed "the absolutely unpardonable crime of trying to confuse the artist with his subject-matter".

The correspondence thus generated lasted through 10 issues and several writers. Wilde wrote 2 more letters and the original Observer reviewer joined in under his own name, while not admitting to have written the review in the first place. Eventually Wilde, with charm and wit, accused Henley, wrongly, of having written all the letters in the debate other than his own, by himself (34). It had been, for the most part, an engaging and friendly dispute, far removed from the acrimony of the Ruskin one. Wilde and Henley were on good terms and remained so until Wilde's fall; though Wilde was later to remark that Henley had a genius for editing every periodical he was given charge of out of existence! (35).

Issue number 104 for November 15 1890 was announced as the last of the Scots Observer. Henceforth it would change its name to the National Observer. The ruling group, the editor and many of the contributors remained the same, but the Scottish emphasis was abandoned. In time, the editorial office was moved to London. The Scots Observer had consistently failed to make money or even to break even, and Fitzroy Bell was wearying of its continual calls on his largesse. It was believed that the dropping of the Scottish emphasis of the paper would widen its appeal in England and increase its circulation so that it might prove financially viable without subsidy. This last hope proved unfounded.

During its brief life, almost exactly 2 years, the Observer had certainly enlivened the Scottish scene. The proprietors had found an ideal editor in Henley who had remarkable flair for good journalism and for attracting other good contributors. And Henley had found good proprietors: clever, amusing, willing to give him a free hand and committed to a determined and irreverent Toryism. It must have seemed a little like the better parts of his previous stay in Edinburgh to Henley, working with people many of whom had been Stevenson's friends and shared much of his outlook on life and politics. They were a group who had resolved to show that not all of Scotland worshipped Gladstone and Rosebery. Above all, they resolved to show that not all of Scotland agreed with what they saw as Gladstone's cowardice and muddled thinking in wishing to give Ireland Home Rule. They provided Balfour and Unionist policy in Ireland with

their most aggressive and enthusiastic champion. The Observer's wit and verve, its sheer delight in ferocious controversy, still go a long way in making palatable its frequently unpleasant and offensive opinions.

CHAPTER 10: CONCLUSION

> The History of Scotland in the eighteenth century furnishes us with one of the most remarkable instances on record of the efficacy of wise legislation in developing the prosperity and ameliorating the character of nations. In the history of Ireland, on the other hand, we may trace with singular clearness the perverting and degrading influence of great legislative injustices, and the manner in which they affect in turn every element of national well-being.
>
> W. E. H. Lecky: the opening of A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century

A wide variety of responses to Ireland and the Irish question have been revealed in the previous chapters. It is now time to look again at these Scottish responses and attitudes and to try to determine if a coherent and viable overall picture can be discerned: if it is possible to identify a generalised Scottish attitude to Ireland in the years from 1880 to 1914. It will be argued here that such an overall attitude can be traced. To find it, it is necessary to examine not only the relationship of late nineteenth century Scotland with Ireland, but also, indeed more importantly, its relationship with England. The position that Scotland and the Scots occupied in Britain, and to a lesser extent in the Empire, and the perception of that position in both Edinburgh and London, inevitably determined to a large extent the Scottish attitude to Ireland. To express it in the terms used by Michael Hechter in his study of the Celtic nations in Britain: the image that one peripheral part of Britain had of another was dependent on the nature of its image of, and relationship to, the core (1).

In seeking for an initial thread running through the different views of Ireland examined, a common denominator, one finds it in a resentment of Ireland. Such a resentment is most obviously found in the Scottish Unionists, where it can be simplified to a straightforward dislike of Ireland: a dislike of its desire for Home Rule, a dislike of its threat to the unity of Britain and the Empire, a dislike of its lack of loyalty to the British ideal. The Unionist approach to Ireland found its epitome in A. J. Balfour, the man who above all expounded the Tory and Unionist case against Home Rule with trenchant force. For 25 years Balfour was, in a very real sense, Unionist policy towards Ireland: the coercionist, the improver, the scourge of nationalism and the prophet of unity. Balfour's loathing for Home Rule was given an added animus by his suspicious contempt for the Irish character and its abilities. In this respect, he embodied in its most pronounced form a feeling that was widespread in the upper reaches of Unionism (2).

In Scottish terms, however, it is possible to see Balfour as less representative here than Bonar Law. Scottish Unionist mistrust of the Irish was certainly much in evidence, but it was based in the bulk of the party less on pure Anglo-Saxonism than on fellow-feeling for the Protestants of Ulster. As Balfour epitomised the aversion to Home Rule through attachment to the belief in the essential unity of the British Isles, so Law epitomised the same aversion based on a belief in the fundamental justice of

Ulster's case. If Balfour was far more representative of Unionist policy as a whole, Law was closer to the purely Scottish Unionist position.

As one moves leftwards through Scottish politics, one finds that resentment of Ireland, though perhaps less to be expected, is still very much in evidence. It was most noticeable in the Liberal Imperialist group which centred on Rosebery. It has been argued here that Rosebery was, in the earlier stages of his career, more influenced by the Irish Party, and in particular by Parnell, than he was ever prepared to or likely to admit. Nonetheless, this group was the spearhead from the 1890s of the growing irritation at the dominance of the Irish problem in both the thinking and the actions of the Liberal party.

This irritation was to a degree shared by the main body of the Scottish Liberal Party, who tended to be in the forefront of progressive Liberalism and radicalism. This was the tradition in which Rosebery began his career, indeed Midlothian in 1879-80 provided its centre. And, while he and his followers moved increasingly away from it in the 1890s and sought to re-align Liberalism, the majority of Scottish Liberals remained inside it. Since nearly all the radicals who had not seceded in 1886 were Scottish Home Rulers in one form or another, their reactions to Ireland were necessarily more complex.

For they could not deny that the impetus towards the devolution of government in the British Isles originated in

Ireland. Without the presence of the Irish Party at Westminster, there would have been no serious consideration of Home Rule for anybody. The logic and the strength of their appeal for self-government was entirely dependent on the Irish demand. What may be termed the pure Scottish nationalists, those with no formal links with the Liberal party, were in a stronger position in this respect. Their demand rested more on its own merits and was not subject to the constraints of party loyalty and discipline. They were able to refer back to the movement of the 1850s, and beyond that to resistance to the Union, to show that the Scottish national demand had its own impetus and traditions. But they too were forced to admit that it was principally because of the Irish that the whole question of nationalism was again in the air; and that it was the existence and the power of the Irish demand that gave them credibility and lifted them out of being merely a single issue pressure group with no practical hope of achieving their aims.

The wider problem for Scottish nationalism lay in its inability to be taken seriously, either by the main force of British Liberalism, or by Irish nationalism. The reason for this was that Scottish nationalists did not share the outlook and assumptions of Irish nationalists. Rather, they shared a common image of Scotland, and Scotland's place in Britain, with the other forces in Scotland's political life. The figures discussed in this study represented the whole range of Scottish politics, from the Labour movement through the different shades of Liberalism to the variety

of Unionism. It will be argued below that there was a basic similarity of outlook amongst all these groups in this respect, though some exception will need to be made for the Labour movement.

Before turning to analyse that outlook, however, there are some other important general points to be considered. A number of writers have been studied but, whereas the full range of political thought has been covered, this is by no means the case with Scottish authors. The writers selected were those who seemed to have some worthwhile opinions to express on the Irish question, and there are therefore some important figures who have been excluded. An imaginative writer can define the terms and limits of his interests and could easily choose to keep Ireland outside them. This was a luxury denied to politicians of any party, who were perforce obliged, however crudely, to address themselves to the problem of Ireland. Though Scotland's greatest writer in this period, Robert Louis Stevenson has been considered, there was no need to look at the work of Ian Maclaren, S. R. Crockett, George Macdonald, Neil Munro or George Douglas Brown (3).

Writers with a single or limited Irish episode in their lives or works have also been excluded, if the episode seemed unconnected with the general pattern of their experience or aims. Into this category falls the distinguished theatre critic William Archer. Archer wrote perceptively and amusingly about the work of Yeats, Shaw,

Wilde, and George Moore, but wrote of them as he did of Ibsen, Pinero or Barrie: he dealt with them purely as artists and as elements of the primarily London artistic scene. He ventured on no conclusions as to the Irishness of their work (4). Thus too, no discussion of the small part played by J. M. Barrie in the negotiations over the Irish Treaty of 1921 has been attempted: partly due to the extreme vagueness and paucity of the evidence, but mostly because it bore no relation to the rest of his extraordinarily successful career (5). Nor did it seem justified to include Andrew Lang, that prolific Scottish journalist and essayist. There are of course Irish references in his biography of Sir Stafford Northcote, but on his own admission he asked others to compose the political chapters in the book. Indeed, with his avowed lack of interest in politics the biography was a curious commission for Lang to have undertaken and it bore no relation to the rest of his enormous output. His biographer loyally describes it as "the nearest approach to hack work that he ever undertook" and one can only conclude that he did so because he was asked to and because he hoped it might prove remunerative (6). Lang's only other work bearing on Ireland was his editing of The Annesley Case for the Notable British Trials series, published in 1912 and the last book to appear in his lifetime. His introduction for the book was stylish and amusing though adding little to the known facts (7).

Two other figures deserve mention in this round-up of Scottish authors of the period. Ian Hay Beith published a

number of successful light novels under the name Ian Hay, beginning with Pip (1907). Though born in England, Beith always described himself as a Scot and taught for a time at Fettes College, the Edinburgh public school. He abandoned teaching for full-time writing in 1912, but several of his most popular works were humorous accounts of public school life. He served with the Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders in the First World War and used his war experience too in his fiction. He wrote one work on Ireland: The Oppressed English (1918) which he headed "A Scot on the Irish Question". Beith was a Unionist, though the main thrust of the book was an ironical attack on the Easter Rising which he saw as a betrayal of the Irish fighting in France.

The final work to be considered in this connection will be printed in full which its quality would seem to amply justify. It is a satire on Parnell's rapid departures from the O'Shea home and is the product of Kenneth Grahame. Grahame of course is famous as the author of The Wind in the Willows and hardly the kind of writer one associates with political sketches. This indeed is the only such piece identified as his, though it is possible that there were others (8). Entitled "A Parable (Overheard and Communicated by our own Cat)", it is a clever skit which delightfully prefigures some of the dialogue in The Wind in the Willows in tone.

> 'Well, old fellow', said the Waterspout to the Verandah, 'and how do you feel, now it's all over?'
>
> 'Very poorly indeed thanks', said the Verandah mournfully. 'Just look at my nice paint! I'm scratched and kicked all over'.

'Paint, indeed!' said the Waterspout, with scorn; 'what does paint matter? Now look at me. I'm all twisted and bent like a bayonet. If it hadn't been for our old friend the Fire-escape there, who took some of the work, I should have been old iron long ago'.

'Well, it's splendid exercise', put in the Fire-escape meditatively; 'I don't mind if he thinks it does him good. But, really, I didn't think he had it in him. He's a marvellous man!'

'Oh, you don't mind, of course!' remarked the Waterspout; 'escaping is your business. But it's not mine, and I don't want to take it up. And now my old friend the sparrow, who's built in me these five years, has had to go. Says she didn't mind the racket so much; but there will be a young family to bring up next spring, and she must think of them'.

'Quite right too', said the Verandah. 'Good old sparrow! But between ourselves, now, it was very funny sometimes, wasn't it? First of all He would slip in, in a modest and unassuming manner, as if he had called to tune the piano; then he - I mean Shea - would come and kick at the door; then she would open it for Sh - I mean him; and He would come sliding down our friend here, like a lamplighter. Then He would pick himself up and ring the visitors' bell; and Shea would open the door for He - I mean him; and all would be surprise, delight, and harmony. And the next night he'd give the Fire-escape a turn.

'He gave me a turn once or twice', said the Waterspout reflectively. 'I've had a burglar down me, and a schoolboy or two, but never the idol of a nation's hopes and aspirations. The boat that carried Caesar and his fortunes will have to take a back seat now'.

'By the by, old chap', said the Verandah 'what will the old Waterspout say? The Grand one, you know - the head of your family'.

'Why', put in the Fire-escape, 'he'll say that the subject is one of vast human interest, and he would like nothing better than to hear it fully and freely discussed. He fears, however, that at his time of life he must leave to younger and more vigorous -'

The measured tread of the policeman approached down the quiet lane, and silence reigned once more in the peaceful little suburb (9).

Grahame was an interesting and complex man and the identification of more of his ephemeral pieces might enable a future

critic to explore his political and social opinions. We must now turn from this brief look at some of the Scottish writers of the period to make some other important general points about the nature of this study.

The public figures who have been examined represent, as stated above, the full range of Scottish political opinion. But in one important respect their constituents had a different view of the Irish question to them. For the ordinary Scot in the lowland cities, the Irish question meant the Irish in their midst as well as the Irish in Ireland. The extent of the Irish migration to Scotland has been outlined in chapter 1. The working-class in Glasgow may have known something of the Irish in Ireland; they knew a lot more of the Irish in Scotland. Conversely, political leaders knew a lot more about the Irish in Ireland than they did about the Irish in their own country. They did not live among or mix with the Irish immigrants, whom they knew of only as that vague but threatening entity: "the Irish vote". They fashioned their stance to Ireland the country, and the element of Ireland in their constituencies approved or disapproved accordingly. In this they were encouraged by many of the leaders of the Irish community in Scotland who promoted the idea that this section of the electorate expected to be dealt with entirely in terms of Ireland. And, after 1886 it was an idea that appealed directly to most Liberals.

An exception must be made here of course for Keir Hardie who, in his work as a mine union organiser and labour

prophet, did have first-hand knowledge of the Irish immigrants. In endeavouring to unite socialism and nationalism, both Scottish and Irish, he and Cunninghame Graham believed that they were meeting all the aspirations of the Irish in Scotland. They also believed that they were paying tribute to a definable Irish tradition: a tradition to which the early part of Parnell's career owed something and which was embodied in Michael Davitt. It was for this reason that they felt particular bitterness when Davitt and his Scottish supporter Ferguson turned against them. It has been suggested here that Hardie and Graham greatly overestimated the influence of the Irish in their early reverses and that because the Irish were such a visible presence in the west of Scotland they made convenient scapegoats. Certainly, for all of Hardie's strictures it is worth mentioning that the Irish community in Scotland did produce several notable labour leaders in the period after the First World War, in particular John Wheatley (10).

If this study has not really considered Scottish reactions to Irish immigration in any depth, it is even less an examination of the Irish in Scotland themselves. Their history is still principally to be found in James Handley's books and much still remains to be done to revise and amplify his important and pioneering work. Handley was an Irishman and the Irish in Scotland have generally lacked sympathetic treatment in the work of Scottish authors. They are entirely absent from the major Scottish fiction of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. One

example traced from a local author, Alexander Wardrop the Coatbridge tailor-poet, is certainly far from sympathetic (11). The experience of Irish immigrants into Scotland found its main contemporary chronicler in Patrick MacGill. MacGill, from Co. Donegal, had first-hand knowledge of the frequently appalling conditions that the working-class Irish suffered in Scotland and described them in a series of graphic and powerful novels, of which the best were Children of the Dead End (1914) and The Rat Pit (1915). More recently, the Irish in Scotland have fared better, receiving sympathetic and intelligent recognition from 2 distinguished Scottish nationalists, Hugh MacDiarmid and Compton Mackenzie, though some residual nativism is still to be found in Scottish nationalism (12).

The exclusion of those of purely Irish descent here has involved ignoring several important figures. In the world of labour these include Ferguson and James Connolly, the Irish labour leader whose early years and career were spent in Edinburgh. Also sadly excluded, for he was a fascinating illustration of the interplay of Irishness and Scottishness, is the novelist Arthur Conan Doyle. Famous as the creator of Sherlock Holmes, Doyle also had a lively interest in politics. He stood unsuccessfully as a Liberal Unionist in Scotland on 2 occasions, in Edinburgh Central in 1900 and Hawick District in 1906, before converting to Home Rule just before the First World War.

Before trying to identify a generalised synthesis of the Scottish attitude to Ireland between 1880 and 1914, it is

perhaps instructive to examine some of the similarities, and then the contrasts, between the positions of the 2 countries. Most obviously, though also most importantly, both were peripheries of the larger British state. Geographically, both were on the fringes of a polity based on the south-east of England. Both were markedly different to England, in history, tradition, religion and social structure; though in this last the contrast was much greater for Ireland than for Scotland. Both countries were forced to define their national lives and their national aspirations with constant reference to their more powerful neighbour.

The most striking comparison that was often made was between the west of Ireland and the Highlands of Scotland. These 2 societies were both agriculturally based and inhabited by small farmers who made a poor living that always threatened to descend into complete destitution. These Celtic people felt themselves divorced from the aristocracies who controlled their lands: in Ireland the landlords were for the most part an alien people who had been imposed upon them; in Scotland the lairds were a native people who had abandoned their roots and their kin in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. As we have seen, the Scottish Crofters' movement was directly inspired by, and paralleled by, the Irish land wars.

The division between Lowlands and Highlands in Scotland, however, had left the Highlands considerably weaker than

was the west of Ireland. Sapped by clearances and emigration, the Highlanders no longer had the will to fight consistently for the survival of their society, let along provide a base for the emergence of a new Celtic nationalism. Rather than being the beginning of a renaissance, the Crofter battles of the 1880s represented an uncharacteristic episode in the life of an exhausted people. Their Lowland champions, though some of them like Blackie and Clark, were distinguished men, were too few in number and too lacking in influence to build an effective bridge between the 2 parts of Scotland. The area where a historian might well look for the stirrings of a revival such as occurred in Ireland produced nothing: the Highlands in this period represent one of the non-events of Scottish history. To underline this point, one needs only to reflect again on the comparison to be made between Fiona Macleod and the group surrounding Yeats and Douglas Hyde.

So this study has thus concentrated on the Scottish Lowlands. Here there are also comparisons to be made with Ireland. Edinburgh and Dublin were both provincial capitals, capitals that lacked the significant ethos of being government centres. Both had developed their own professional and intellectual middle-class, unconnected with their respective aristocracies. When we turn to Glasgow, however, the obvious comparison is with Belfast, and nationalist Ireland could show no area that could be described as similar to the industrial belt of the west of Scotland. Overall, nationalist Ireland can be said to have been much more of a single entity than the more diversified Scotland.

Taken as a whole, the Lowlands of Scotland seem to have more in common with England than Ireland, and, on any but the most superficial level, the differences between Scotland and Ireland are more apparent, and more real, than the similarities. In nothing is this truer than in their respective images of themselves.

The Irish, when they considered Scotland, were wont to decry the lack of national pride and feeling in the Scots. They accused them of a base subservience to England and of having forgotten their history, in particular their history of independence. This belief was erroneous and rested on a misunderstanding of the nature of Scottish patriotism and of certain vital fundamentals of Scottish society. We shall look first at the latter misapprehension.

The Irish tended to view national considerations in the late nineteenth century through the medium of Home Rule, reasonably enough since it was a powerful, even revolutionary, idea and their own creation. They thus had a natural inclination to judge the vigour of a country's national life through the strength of its demand for Home Rule and the degree of its commitment to it. What they frequently failed to perceive in Scotland was the existence of a distinctive and independent tradition in 3 important branches of her national life: education, religion and law. These traditions predated the Union but had survived it, and they were all recognisably absent in Ireland. What they meant in Scottish terms was that 3 vital elements of the national

consciousness by and large had little to gain from any devolution of government.

The Scots were intensely proud of their education system which they held was essentially more democratic than that of England and thus allowed for the successful progress of the "lad o' pairts". In education the battle for "Home Rule" had been fought in 1886 when control had been wrested from a reluctant Home Office through the efforts of Rosebery and others and transferred to the newly-created Scottish Secretary (13). In religion, the Scots had an established popular national church, whereas the Irish had only recently secured the disestablishment of a minority alien church. The Church of Scotland jealously guarded its status as the leader of Scottish national opinion and the position of its annual assembly as a species of proto-parliament. It could therefore regard any proposal to supersede it with a secular elected body with little enthusiasm. And what partisanship was to be found in the Presbyterian churches could often be channelled into the continuing internecine feuds arising from the Disruption. The law in Scotland was taken very seriously by all classes and was widely held to be superior in many respects to its English counterpart. It was self-regulatory as English lawyers and politicians usually avoided trying to interfere in what they saw as its peculiarly arcane mysteries. Again the contrast with Ireland was marked where the law was traditionally regarded as an alien spectator sport to be either used for personal gain or to be avoided.

These 3 independent aspects of Scottish life had combined together to produce an intellectual and cultural national tradition. As Yeats for one pointed out, Ireland lagged behind in this respect too; indeed he wished to try and help create such a tradition for Ireland himself. For the period we have been discussing this distinctive Scottish intellectual tradition can be characterised as the product of democratic education and theological controversy united to the legacies of the Enlightenment, Burns and Scott. It was indeed a powerful mixture and it ensured that no Scot need look to the nature of how he was governed to establish his national identity.

The Scots of the late nineteenth century were intensely proud of their country and patriotic about it. But they combined their enthusiasm for Scotland with an enthusiasm for Britain and an enthusiasm for the Empire. This was not simply a question of subsuming their Scottishness into Britishness, the patriotic loyalty operated on both levels at once. They felt themselves to be both Scottish and British and each emotion was dependent on the other. This view of the nature of Britain was fundamentally alien to the Irish. In this sense to be a "North Briton" was in the nature of things and a matter of course: to be a "West Briton" was not.

The Scots saw themselves as having an essential community of interest with England, a community of interest that was not shaken by frequent irritation with the English. Nor

was it shaken by the frequent inability of the English to comprehend this Scottish analysis of the fundamentals of the British state. It remained intact because the Scots had worked out a satisfactory inter-relationship between themselves and the British centre or core.

They accepted that Scotland was and would remain a periphery within Britain. The answer lay in Scottish penetration of the centre. To London went a string of politicians, journalists and writers, and through them Scotland occupied a place of acknowledged importance in British life. The names that have made up this study demonstrate the success of Scots in the heart of the Empire. Scotland provided 4 Prime Ministers (Rosebery, Balfour, Campbell-Bannerman and Bonar Law), and 3 Lord Chancellors (Loreburn, Haldane and Finlay). The ubiquity of the Scottish London journalist was everywhere acknowledged by contemporaries, and was epitomised by the career of William Robertson Nicoll, editor of the powerful British Weekly. It was commented on at length by the Yorkshire writer T. W. H. Crosland in his book The Unspeakable Scot. This mostly humorous work purported to be a lament for the miseries of the English, surrounded by and overtaken by ambitious Scots at every turn.

> I do not think it is an exaggeration to describe England as a Scot-ridden country. To whatever department of activity one looks one finds therein, 'working his way up' for all he is worth and by 'none too gentle' methods, the so-called canny Scot. In some professions, notably that of journalism, as I have shown, he has made himself more or less predominant.... To rid the Press of his influence would be an excellent thing for the Press. It cannot be shown that he is of the least use in journalism, or that he does things any better, whether as reporter, sub-editor, or editor,

> than the average Englishman. And it can be shown that he has used his influence on the Press for purposes which, however legitimate they may appear to him, are not in the public interest. It is not in the public interest that every newspaper one picks up should contain certificates of character for the Scotch.

Crosland finished his book with a few rules "for the general guidance of young Scotchmen who wish to succeed in this country and who do not desire to and further opprobium to the Scotch character", of which the last was:

> IF WITHOUT SERIOUS INCONVENIENCE TO YOURSELF YOU CAN MANAGE TO REMAIN AT HOME, PLEASE DO (14).

The Scots took these kinds of strictures in good part, for they testified to the success of their vision of the British relationship. Indeed at times they revelled in them, as 2 famous quotations from a play by that most astute of professional Scotsmen J. M. Barrie illustrate:

> There are few more impressive sights in the world than a Scotsman on the make.
>
> A young Scotsman of your ability let loose upon the world with £300, what could he not do? It's almost appalling to think of; especially if he went among the English (15).

Scots had managed to make their periphery an essential ingredient of the core, while preserving its distinctive features. In politics Scotland was immensely important in Liberalism since the triumph of Gladstone's first Midlothian campaign in 1879. The Scottish politician was expected to get on at Westminster and become a significant British figure, and he was also expected to remember his home country and look to her interests at the same time.

It was on this basis that the Scottish Liberals proceeded with the pressure for Scottish Home Rule. The initial impetus might have come from the example of the Irish, but the Scottish version was to be not a bold stroke for freedom and independence, but an integral part of the continuing celebration of the Scottish-British relationship. It was always stressed that the demand was based on reason more than sentiment and on mutual convenience and for the greater strengthening of Britain and the Empire. In this last it was qualitatively different from the movement for Scottish Home Rule of the last 20 years. Scottish Home Rule before the First World War was intended to be a concession made from strength and was sought by those who were secure in the knowledge of the intrinsic durability and power of Britain and the Empire. Precisely because of that unquestioned durability, the granting of a measure of independence to a loyal and contented part of Britain could only further strengthen its adhesion to the whole.

For this image of Scottish patriotism and of the nature of Britain ran through the whole range of Scottish political life. It was implicit in Unionists and Liberals alike. It was also shared, despite their occasional bursts of despairing anti-Englishness, by the pure nationalists and, broadly, by Keir Hardie and his Scottish followers, though these latter might wish to alter fundamentally the whole context of the society in which it operated.

This outlook underlay the work of Scottish writers, as it did the careers of Scottish politicians. It found its most

outlandish manifestation in the works of the so-called "Kailyard School". The Kailyarders were a number of writers who produced a steady stream of idealised pen-portraits of Scottish life which they characterised as a mixture of dour Calvinism, pawky humour and well-hidden emotional kindliness. This style of writing was launched by J. M. Barrie in his Thrums books, and was carried on with enthusiastic dedication by S. R. Crockett, Ian Maclaren, Annie S. Swan, Gabriel Setoun, George Macdonald in his worst moments, and others. The Kailyarders were immensely popular in England, but many Scots had their reservations. They felt that these authors were betraying the essential relationship between Scotland and England by promoting a foolish and inaccurate picture of the home country. The relationship rested on a complete loyalty to Scotland-in-Britain: the Kailyarders were perverting it by selling false images for the amusement of England.

The Irish, too, had their writers with Kailyard tendencies, such as Jane Barlow and Katherine Tynan. But their work had a sharper edge to it and was, in any case, dwarfed by the power of those producing genuine and enduring Irish literature. The whole thrust of what Ireland was aiming for between 1880 and 1914 was different to the ideals of Scotland. Ireland was not striving to improve her position as periphery, she was trying to shift the centre and break the existing mould of British politics. Members of the Irish Parliamentary Party were often to be heard making the same noises about loyalty and empire as Scots M.P.s. But

whatever adherence they had to such ideas was dependent on the establishment of their own centre, their own country, as the base for Irish political life. They did not seek to help their country through the measures of the British parties, they had their own party and generally kept aloof from the mainstream of British politics. They viewed the British constitution with a shrewd irreverence, where the Scots could so easily view it with a sententious and hierarchical respect.

The Scots could talk of Celtic Nationalism and Celtic solidarity, just as the Irish could talk of fundamental loyalty to the Empire. But ultimately the 2 countries approached the whole fabric and nature of what constituted Britain from completely differing standpoints. A majority of Scots genuinely supported the idea of Irish Home Rule and believed that Ireland had suffered from misgovernment and the loss of her national life. But they did not believe that the same applied to them. In a sense they felt that Ireland had somehow missed out on the benefits of British-ness, on the special position of a secure national consciousness within a greater whole, and they hoped that Home Rule might lift the Irish into that happy position alongside them. All Scottish attitudes to Ireland between 1880 and 1914 were built upon these concepts of what Scotland was, what Britain was, and what Ireland might become.

As a final illustration of these attitudes we may look briefly at the work in Ireland of Lord Aberdeen. Aberdeen

was twice Liberal Viceroy in Ireland: in 1886 and from 1906 to 1915. He was a convinced Home Ruler who determined not to be merely a ceremonial figure-head but to work actively for the improvement of Irish conditions of life. In this he was warmly supported by his wife, a woman of commanding presence and strong opinions. The Aberdeens attempted to shift the emphasis of the Viceregal court away from the Unionist Anglo-Irish. They refused to attend Punchestown Races, a traditional date in the Viceroy's calendar, because they disapproved of racing and gambling. They invited Home Rulers to Viceregal functions, discussed the amelioration of Irish poverty with figures as radical as Davitt in 1886 and Larkin in 1913, and worked tirelessly for the encouragement of Irish manufactures. Aberdeen was always prepared to sponsor and attend Home Rule and nationalist meetings when invited, if his invariable proviso was accommodated: that some sort of loyal resolution was passed. For he always stressed that Home Rule must be promoted only in the context of complete ultimate loyalty to the Crown and Britain.

The Aberdeens were popular in Ireland and respected for the obvious sincerity of their purpose. This respect, however, was tempered with an irreverent humour at their unrelenting seriousness and worthiness. They acquired the sobriquets "Jumping Jack and Blowsy Bella", references to his fondness for the polka and her impressive figure. It was also felt that their view of Ireland was an extremely naive one, based on little genuine knowledge, if plenty of frequently

misguided enthusiasm, for the country. It was related that at their first Viceregal reception Lady Aberdeen asked Michael Morris, the Unionist law officer, if there were many Home Rulers in the room. "My Lady, the only Home Rulers present are yourself, His Excellency, and the waiters" he replied.

The point that surely should be brought out about the Aberdeens is that they were trying to create an Ireland that conformed to the Scottish ideal: independent in spirit yet fundamentally loyal, materially prosperous and serious in purpose, and thus able to take her place alongside Scotland as a full member of the British community (16). The Aberdeens left Ireland the year before the Easter Rising, the event that was to finally illustrate the impossibility of trying to unite the Scottish and Irish views of national development.

FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER 1

1. William Ferguson: Scotland: 1689 to the Present (Edinburgh 1968) p. 313.

2. E. T. Raymond: The Man of Promise: Lord Rosebery, A Critical Study (London 1923).

3. John Mercer: Scotland The Devolution of Power (London 1973) p. 42.

4. James E. Handley: The Irish in Modern Scotland (Cork 1947) p. 1. This pioneering study, together with the same author's The Irish in Scotland (Cork 1943) and The Navvy in Scotland (Cork n.d.), is essential for an understanding of the history of the Irish in Scotland.

5. ibid.

6. ibid p. 45.

7. Owen Dudley Edwards: "The Catholic Press in Scotland since the Restoration of the Hierarchy": The Innes Review vol. XXIX, 2 pp. 168-9.

8. Though de facto Bishops, since the Hierarchy was not restored in Scotland until 1878, their official title was "Apostolic Vicar".

9. For a full account of Ferguson, see Handley: The Irish in Modern Scotland pp. 269-273, and Ian Wood: "Irish Immigrants and Scottish Radicalism, 1880-1906" in ed. Ian Macdougall: Essays in Scottish Labour History: A Tribute to W. H. Marwick (Edinburgh 1978) pp. 69-83.

10. The actual representation of the Scottish constituencies in the general elections of 1885-1910 was as follows:

Year	Liberal	Unionist
1885	62	10
1886	43	29
1892	50	22
1895	39	33
1900	34	38
1906	60	12
1910	61	11

"Unionist" denotes Conservatives and, after 1886, Liberal Unionists. "Liberal" denotes Gladstonian Liberals and, after 1906, Labour members. The 1910 figures refer equally to both the general elections held in that year: though 2 seats changed hands in December, the overall position remained the same.

FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER 2

1. Tom Nairn: The Break-Up of Britain: Crisis and Neo-Nationalism (London 1977) p. 95.

2. For a full account of the Association for the Vindication of Scottish Rights, see: Sir Reginald Coupland: Welsh and Scottish Nationalism: A Study (London 1954) pp. 281-290.

3. Magnus Magnusson et al: The Glorious Privilege: The History of "The Scotsman" (Edinburgh 1967) pp. 34-5.

4. The Times, November 27 1879.

5. The Scotsman, same date.

6. Thomas J. Spinner Jr.: George Joachim Goschen: The Transformation of a Victorian Liberal (Cambridge 1973) pp. 101, 127.

7. Hansard: April 13 1886, columns 1538-9.

8. W. E. Gladstone: The Irish Question (London 1886) pp. 4-5, 34, 36.

9. Anna M. Stoddart: John Stuart Blackie: A Biography (2 vols. Edinburgh 1895) pp. 252, 257, 273.

   J. M. Barrie: An Edinburgh Eleven: Pencil Portraits from College Life (London 1889) pp. 27-34 gives a brief humorous picture of Blackie as a political campaigner.

   J. H. Millar: A Literary History of Scotland (London 1903) pp. 608-9 offers a devastating critique of Blackie as an author.

10. Mitchell was referring to the fact that the first Home Rule Bill had proposed to exclude Irish members from Westminster.

11. W. Mitchell: Scotland and Home Rule (Edinburgh 1888) pp. 30-1. Salisbury's speech had been delivered in Derby on December 19 1887.

12. The Marquess of Bute: Parliament in Scotland (Edinburgh n.d.).

13. Scottish Versus Irish Grievances (Edinburgh n.d.).

14. R. D. MacKenzie: Home Rule for Scotland: Why Should Scotland Wait? (Edinburgh n.d.).

15. The Union of 1707 Viewed Financially (Edinburgh n.d.).

    Scottish Versus Irish Grievances.

16. W. Mitchell: Home Rule for Scotland (Edinburgh 1889). This is a different pamphlet to that of a similar title, and by the same author, discussed above.

17. Quoted in Keith Webb: The Growth of Nationalism in Scotland (revised edition London 1978) p. 61. I have been unable to trace the original reference. Webb gives no title for the pamphlet, but describes it as published in 1890.

18. T. D. Wanliss: A Colonial View of Home Rule (Dundee 1890). See also the same author's Bars to British Unity (Dundee 1895).

19. G. B. Clark: A Plea for the Nationalisation of the Land (London n.d.).

20. Hunter was the author of an S.H.R.A. pamphlet on the economic hopes for Home Rule: The Financial Relations of England and Scotland (Edinburgh 1892).

21. For an account of Cunninghame Graham's remarkable speech, see Chapter 4.

22. Hansard: April 9 1889, cols. 69-124.

23. An account of The Scotsman's and The Scots Observer's campaign against the Parnell freedom is given in Chapter 9.

24. Scottish Liberal Party Minutes (Manuscript Room, University of Edinburgh Library), (hereafter: S.L.P. Mins.) November 7 1889. H. J. Hanham Scottish Nationalism (London 1969) quotes an identical resolution as being passed the year before, but I can find no reference to it in the minutes.

25. S.L.P. Mins. February 7 1890.

26. Hansard: February 18 1890, cols. 677-723.

27. S.L.P. Mins. May 15 1890 and November 20 1890.

28. George Lancaster: The Landlord and Home Rule Questions: Considered on Political Grounds, and Tested by Christian Principles (Edinburgh 1891).

29. S.L.P. Mins. January 15 1891.

30. ibid February 27 1891.

31. Hansard: March 6 1891, cols. 445-456.

32. ibid: February 10 1892, col. 163.

33. ibid: April 26 1892, cols. 1450-2.

34. ibid: April 29 1892, cols. 1687-1714.

35. S.L.P. Mins. March 24 1893.

36. Hansard 1893: Sir John Leng April 19, col. 688.

R. T. Reid August 8, col. 1656.

Eugene Wason August 30, col. 1528.

37. ibid: April 18, cols. 616-7 and August 30, col. 1512.

38. ibid: May 10, col. 562.

39. ibid: February 16, col. 1676.

40. It should, of course, be remembered that when Gladstone originally proposed to exclude the Irish members in 1886, the Unionists were just as vehemently opposed.

41. Hansard: August 9 1893, col. 1694.

42. ibid: September 1 1893, cols. 1789, 1795.

43. Trevelyan had been appointed Chief Secretary for Ireland by Gladstone in 1882. Of nervous and sensitive disposition, he found the endless harrying of the Irish members too much for him. He resigned in 1884 when his health threatened to break down completely. It was said that during his 2 year term of office his hair turned white. He joined Chamberlain in rejecting the 1886 Irish Home Rule Bill and fought, and lost, the subsequent general election as a Liberal Unionist. The following year, however, he returned to the fold, and won a by-election as a Gladstonian Liberal. Despite his brief defection, Gladstone made him Scottish Secretary in 1892.

For R. T. Reid, see: R. F. V. Heuston: Lives of the Lord Chancellors: 1885-1940 (Oxford 1964) pp. 134-177.

44. Hansard: June 23 1893, cols. 1828-1861.

45. ibid: April 2 1894, cols. 1127-1164. The S.H.R.A. attack was quoted by Sir H. Maxwell (Conservative Wigton). See also: Memorandum by the Scottish Home Rule Association with Reference to the Scottish Grand Committee to be Proposed (Edinburgh 1894).

46. Hansard: April 3 1894, cols. 1287-1314.

47. ibid: April 27 1894, cols. 1590-1613.

48. ibid: March 29 1895, cols. 523-560.

49. ibid: May 15 1898, cols. 1689-1744.

50. S.L.P. Mins. October 28 1898.

51. October 14 1895.

FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER 3

1. Quoted in Webb: Growth of Nationalism in Scotland p. 64.

2. ed. William Knox: Scottish Labour Leaders 1918-1939: A Biographical Dictionary (Edinburgh 1984) pp. 62, 218-9.

3. Letter in author's possession. Hogge's comment does not perhaps imply a very great familiarity with Irish history or historiography.

4. The Scottish Patriot, No. 6, July 1903.

5. Compton Mackenzie: My Life and Times: Octave 2 (London 1963) p. 259.

6. No. 11, July 1903.

7. No. 1, February 1903; No. 9, October 1903; No. 18, July 1904; No. 23, December 1904.

8. No. 10, November 1903; No. 21, October 1904.

   This is the only piece of anti-Semitism any of the Scottish nationalist press seems to have indulged in: generally they were happily free from adding this prejudice to their occasional outbursts against England or Ireland.

9. No. 36, January 1906.

   The Patriot seems to have been very confused here. The play was written in 1893-4 and refused a licence by the Lord Chamberlain, the theatre censor. The Stage Society put it on in 1902, causing something of a critical and popular outcry. But there was no question of the play being closed down as any Stage Society performance was legally a private production. The play was publicly performed in America: and when the cast moved the production from Conneticut to New York in 1905, they were all arrested after the first night. Presumably it was a garbled version of this episode that The Patriot had picked up on.

   See: Maurice Colbourne: The Real Bernard Shaw (London 1949) p. 123.

10. No. 2, April 1903.

11. No. 3, May 1903.

12. No. 36, January 1906.

13. February 15 1906.

14. June 12 1906; August 9 1906.

15. S.L.P. Mins. October 4 1906.

16. Hansard: April 9 1906, col. 1013.

17. S.L.P. Mins. February 7 1907.

18. John Wilson: CB: A Life of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman (New York 1973) p. 155.

19. Mitchell did not ever found his own nationalist periodical, but he had contributed a series of articles on Scottish Home Rule to the Scots Magazine, under the pseudonym "Harry Gow", during 1890 and 1891.

20. T. P. O'Connor: Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman (London 1909) p. 24.

21. Quoted in: Wilson: CB p. 78.

22. ibid: pp. 83, 104.

23. Dennis Gwynn: The Life of John Redmond (London 1932) p. 115.

24. O'Connor: Campbell-Bannerman p. 74.

25. ibid: p. 8.

26. Hansard: May 26 1908, cols. 968-972.

27. No. 11, June 1909; No. 16, November 1909.

28. Also the list of those discounted as possibles through office-holding includes Gulland (Junior Lord of the Treasury, Chief Whip during the War), who was clearly a potential recruit. Wanliss' figure was not far off the mark, using the evidence of the Scottish Nationalist Committee.

29. S.L.P. Mins. March 25 1909, October 7 1910.

30. No. 18, January 1910.

31. No. 21, April 1910; No. 28, November 1910.

32. The Manifesto is printed in full in The Scotsman of August 5 1910. Facing it is a scathing leader on its authors.

33. No. 40, November 1911.

34. The Scotsman, May 6 1911.

35. Hansard: August 16 1911, cols. 1929-1934.

36. S.L.P. Mins. October 6 and 7 1911.

37. ibid: December 7 1911.

38. Hansard: February 28 1912, cols. 1446-1490.

39. ibid: April 11 1912, col. 1403.

40. No. 46, May 1912.

41. No. 43, July 1912.

42. The Scotsman, May 25 1912.

43. Hansard: July 3 1912, cols. 1155-8.

44. S.L.P. Mins. November 29 and 30 1912; October 17 1912.

45. ibid: June 10 1913; July 30 1913; September 18 1913. McGhee's visit had been postponed from 1912: see note 37. above.

46. No. 51, October 1912. See also: No. 48, July 1912; No. 63, October 1913; No. 66, January 1914.

47. Hansard: May 30 1913, cols. 471-550; June 5 1913, col. 1178.

48. The Times, September 11 1913, published under the headline: "Home Rule: Lord Loreburn's Appeal to the Nation: A Liberal Plea for a Conference".

49. On April 2 1914, for example, Winston Churchill and F. E. Smith drafted a federalist proposal together, though nothing eventually came of it. Peter Rowland: The Last Liberal Governments: Vol. 2: Unfinished Business 1911-1914 (London 1971) p. 328.

50. J. E. Kendle: "The Round Table Movement and Home Rule All Round" in Historical Journal XI (1968) pp. 332-353.

51. See: Oliver writing to Bonar Law, August 10 and 20 1912. Bonar Law Papers, Box 27, Folder 1, Items 32 and 47.

52. p. 53.

53. p. 119.

54. Hansard: May 15 1914, cols. 1467-1549; May 20 1914, cols. 1936-7.

55. Gordon Donaldson et al: "Scottish Devolution: The Historical Background" in ed. J. N. Wolfe: Government and Nationalism in Scotland (Edinburgh 1969) p. 10.

56. Erskine of Marr was a wide-ranging writer with an interest in the revival of Scottish Catholicism and Gaelic culture. See: Edwards: "The Catholic Press in Scotland" pp. 175-7. In 1893 he had edited The Houyhnhnm, a journal dedicated to progressive "individualism", which contained 2 favourable references to Scottish Home Rule: No. 3, April and No. 4, May. Reasonably enough, given its name, The Houyhnhnm became the periodical of a Swift Society, which Erskine had founded, after its fifth number.

FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER 4

1. R. B. Cunninghame Graham: Success (London 1902) pp. 2, 4.

2. See: ed. C. T. Watts: Joseph Conrad's Letters to Cunninghame Graham (Cambridge 1969).

3. Cedric Watts and Laurence Davies: Cunninghame Graham: A Critical Biography (Cambridge 1979) pp. 50-1. The most recent, and the most reliable, biography of Graham.

4. The Scotsman, January 14 and 16 1886.

5. Daily Review, June 10 1886.

6. Hansard: February 1 1887, cols. 444-5.

7. The day after he had been arrested R. B. Haldane came down to the magistrate's court to arrange bail for Graham. When, in 1912, Haldane was appointed Lord Chancellor, Graham wrote to congratulate him. In his reply, Haldane reminisced about the events of 1887: "I believe that if I had now to bail you out again at Bow Street I should command the confidence of the beak more completely than I did then". Cunninghame Graham Papers, National Library of Scotland, (hereafter C.G.P.), Ms Dep. 205, Box 1.

8. ibid: letters to Gabriella Cunninghame Graham from Oscar Wilde and William Morris promising to come.

9. Reproduced in: A. F. Tschiffely: Don Roberto: Being the Account of the Life and Works of R. B. Cunninghame Graham 1852-1936 (London 1937) pp. 190-1.

10. William Stewart: J. Keir Hardie: A Biography (London 1921) p. 11.

11. Iain McLean: Keir Hardie (London 1975) p. 25.

12. Keir Hardie/Emrys Hughes Papers, National Library of Scotland, (hereafter K.H.P.), Ms Dep. 176, vol. 8.

13. Stewart: Keir Hardie p. 37.

14. K.H.P. Ms Dep. 176, vol. 8.

15. T. W. Moody: "Michael Davitt and the British Labour Movement 1882-1906", Transactions of the Royal Historical Society 5th. ser., 3 (1953) p. 66.

16. James G. Kellas: "The Mid-Lanark By-Election (1888) and the Scottish Labour Party (1888-1894)", Parliamentary Affairs vol. 8, 1965 p. 322.

17. K.H.P. Ms 1809, Acc. 504.

18. ibid.

19. Wood: "Irish Immigrants and Scottish Radicalism, 1880-1906" p. 78.

20. April 6 1888.

21. Emrys Hughes: Keir Hardie (London 1956) p. 45.

22. K.H.P. Ms 1809, Acc. 504.

23. ibid.

24. Moody: "Michael Davitt and the British Labour Movement" p. 67.

25. The resolution they passed is printed in The Scotsman March 20 1888.

26. McLean: Keir Hardie p. 30.

27. Michael Keating and David Bleiman: Labour and Scottish Nationalism (London 1979) Chapter 1: Parts III and V.

28. Wood: "Irish Immigrants and Scottish Radicalism".

J. F. McCaffrey: "The Irish Vote in Glasgow in the Later Nineteenth Century": Innes Review vol. XXI, Spring 1970, pp. 30-6.

29. Alan O'Day: The English Face of Irish Nationalism: Parnellite Involvement in British Politics 1880-1906 (Dublin 1977) p. 112.

30. David Lowe: Souvenirs of Scottish Labour (Glasgow 1919) p. 61.

31. Tschiffely: Don Roberto p. 186.

Hughes: Keir Hardie p. 49.

32. K.H.P. Ms 1809, Acc. 504.

33. Contemporary Review, February 1888.

34. The full programme is printed in: Lowe: Souvenirs of Scottish Labour p. 3.

35. Hansard: April 9 1889, cols. 97-8.

36. H. M. Pelling: The Origins of the Labour Party; 1880-1900 (2nd. edition Oxford 1965) p. 105.

37. Tschiffely: Don Roberto p. 254.

38. The Labour Prophet May 1893. Quoted in Watts and Davies: Cunningham Graham p. 116.

39. The full text is printed in: Tschiffely: Don Roberto pp. 255-9.

40. R. B. Cunninghame Graham: His People (London 1906) pp. 274-287. In the election campaign of 1918, Graham was to claim that he had been the only non-Irish M.P. to attend Parnell's funeral. In fact there is no evidence that he crossed to Dublin for the funeral. Further, Graham was fond of writing sketches and reflections on his friends' funerals (Hardie, Conrad, Blunt, Morris); there was no such sketch for Parnell, just this "Memory".

41. Hansard: February 10 1892, cols. 134-5.

42. Kellas: "The Mid-Lanark By-Election (1888) and the Scottish Labour Party (1888-1894)" p. 325.

43. Moody: "Michael Davitt and the British Labour Movement" pp. 71-2.

44. Glasgow Observer, June 8 1892 shows that this Irish paper was again opposing the S.L.P. candidates.

45. C.G.P. Ms Dep. 205, Box 1.

46. Tschiffely: Don Roberto p. 279.

Samuel Levenson: James Connolly: A Biography (paperback edition London 1977) pp. 35-6.

47. The Labour Leader, March 31 1894 and April 4 1894. For his part, Davitt wrote that Hardie should "enter into political partnership" with John Redmond and Tim Healy: "For monumental egoism and political cussedness I question whether any other people can equal these products of Ireland and Scotland". Moody: "Michael Davitt and the British Labour Movement" p. 73.

48. Frank Harris: My Life and Loves (one vol. paperback edition London 1966) pp. 704, 767, 769.

49. Saturday Review, March 21 1896 and April 4 1896.

50. ibid: May 30 1896.

51. Watts and Davies: Cunninghame Graham, p. 156 "those awful McCrocketts and Larens" is a humorous reference to 2 of the leading writers of the Kailyard School: S. R. Crockett and Ian McLaren.

52. Frank Harris: Bernard Shaw: An Unauthorised Biography Based on Firsthand Information (London 1931) pp. 128-9.

53. The painter William Rothenstein recalled going to the opening night of Arms and the Man with Aubrey Beardsley. They laughed so much and so loudly that they attracted the attention of an elderly lady. During the interval she "came up to us, saying that our enthusiasm had given her so much pleasure, that she would like to make our acquaintance; she introduced herself as Mrs. Bontine". This was Cunninghame Graham's mother. Stanley Weintraub: Beardsley (paperback edition London 1972) pp. 97-8.

54. C.G.P. Ms Dep. 205, Box 1a.

55. Shaw to Gabriella Cunninghame Graham: ibid.

56. The Bodley Head Bernard Shaw Collected Plays With their Prefaces (7 vols. London 1971-4), vol. 2 pp. 418-420.

57. Watts and Davies: Cunninghame Graham p. 134.

58. Saturday Review, November 7 1925.

59. Watts and Davies: Cunninghame Graham p. 129.

60. Tschiffely: Don Roberto pp. 384-5. Graham's wife, Gabriella, had written a life of Santa Teresa of Avila, and had imbued him with some of her mystical reverence for the notion of sanctity.

61. C.G.P. Ms Dep. 205, Box 1a.

62. Letter to William Rothenstein, April 25 1895: Watts and Davies: Cunninghame Graham p. 135.

63. Tschiffely: Don Roberto p. 349.

64. Watts and Davies: Cunninghame Graham p. 135.

65. Tschiffely: Don Roberto p. 350.

66. C.G.P. Ms Dep. 205, Box 1a. In a similar letter of thanks for kind comments on the Ballad to Rothenstein, Wilde wrote: "Yes: it is something to have made a 'sonnet out of skilly' (Cunninghame Graham will explain to you what skilly is, you must never know by personal experience)". ed. Rupert Hart-Davis: The Letters of Oscar Wilde (London 1962) p. 707.

67. Saturday Review, March 4 1905.

68. Saturday Review, November 7 1908. For a brief account of the rectorial see: Stewart: Keir Hardie pp. 258-9.

69. Stewart: Keir Hardie pp. 332-3.

70. Glasgow Herald, December 11 1913 (reported in the third person).

71. Wilfrid Scawen Blunt: My Diaries: Being a Personal Narrative of Events, 1888-1914 (2 vols. London 1919-20), vol. 2 p. 205.

72. Letter to Dr. J. Macintyre, July 10 1914: C.G.P. Ms 6519: 85.

73. In a review of W. H. Hudson's The Purple Land: Saturday Review, December 3 1904.

74. C.G.P. Ms Dep. 205, Box 1a.

75. Graham wrote a moving account of his friend's funeral: "With the North-East Wind": R. B. Cunninghame Graham: Brought Forward (London 1916) pp. 51-9.

76. Since he was 62 at the outbreak of war, the War Office understandably turned down Graham's request for an active service job. He was, however, sent to South America to buy horses for use on the western front. With his lifetime love and regard for the horse as the noblest of creatures, he found it a melancholy errand. Characteristically, he wrote a short sketch on his experience: "Bopicua": ibid pp. 185-205.

77. Graham promised that if elected he would press for all conscientious objectors to receive "a petticoat at the national expense". Watts and Davies: Cunninghame Graham p. 244.

78. Compton Mackenzie: Echoes (London 1954) p. 32.

FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER 5

1. Sir Thomas Gibson-Carmichael Bt. 1859-1926. Born Edinburgh, 1859; educated at Cambridge; private secretary to Trevelyan (Secretary for Scotland) 1886; unsuccessful Liberal Candidate Peebles and Selkirk 1892; M.P. Midlothian in succession to Gladstone 1895-1900; Chairman Scottish Liberal Association 1892-1903; Colonial Governor in Australia and India 1908-1917; created Lord Carmichael 1917.

   Sir Thomas Glen-Coats. Born Renfrewshire 1846; careers in business and army; unsuccessful Liberal Candidate West Renfrewshire 1900; M.P. West Renfrewshire 1906-1910.

   Charles M. Douglas 1865-1924. Born Edinburgh; educated at Edinburgh and Freiburg universities; 7 years lecturer in Moral Philosophy Edinburgh university; Liberal M.P. North West Lanarkshire 1899-1906; unsuccessful candidate South Lanarkshire 1910 (second election) as a Liberal Unionist.

   The other Roseberyites mentioned are covered in the text.

2. The Marquess of Crewe K.G.: Lord Rosebery (2 vols. London 1931) p. 109.

3. Charles A. Cooper: An Editor's Retrospect: Fifty Years of Newspaper Work (London 1896) pp. 384-5.

4. John Morley: The Life of William Ewart Gladstone (new edition in 2 vols. London 1905), vol. 2, p. 197.

5. Cooper: Editor's Retrospect p. 388.

6. "the father and son of the Scottish people": Jane T. Stoddart: The Earl of Rosebery: An Illustrated Biography (London 1900) p. 63.

   "the uncrowned King of Scotland": J. A. Hammerton: Lord Rosebery Imperialist (London 1901) p. 59.

   See also: Barrie: An Edinburgh Eleven pp. 8-16 for an eloquent tribute to Rosebery's popularity.

7. Morley: Life of Gladstone vol. 2, pp. 221-3.

8. Rosebery Papers, National Library of Scotland (hereafter referred to as RP) Ms. 10077, item 54.

9. March 11 1881: RP Ms. 10010, item 20.

10. Part of the Memorandum is reproduced in Robert Rhodes James: Rosebery: A Biography of Archibald Philip, Fifth Earl of Rosebery (2nd. edition London 1963) p. 114.

11. F. S. L. Lyons: Charles Stewart Parnell (paperback edition London 1978) p. 157.

12. James: Rosebery pp. 114-5.

13. Hansard: June 13 1881, vol. 262, col. 321. I have been unable to trace the reference to Disraeli. (Disraeli made a major speech in Edinburgh, on franchise reforms, on October 29 1867, but the sentence does not occur in that speech.)

14. Thomas F. G. Coates: Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches (2 vols. London 1900) p. 359.

15. September 27 1881: RP 10037, 32.

16. Crewe: Rosebery p. 146.

17. ibid p.147.

18. May 6 1882: RP 10176, 49.

19. A full account of the letters that passed between them can be found in: James: Rosebery pp. 136-150.

20. "beg to express my regret": Crewe: Rosebery p. 153.

"I confess I think": James: Rosebery p. 130.

Rosebery presumably had hoped for the chance to further strengthen his position in Scotland by the exercise of a little patronage.

21. June 27 1882: Crewe: Rosebery pp. 154-5.

22. See: James: Rosebery pp. 140-150.

Crewe: Rosebery pp. 157-9.

23. Childers was not at the time a Scottish member, being M.P. for Pontefract, but was to become one, being elected for Edinburgh South in the 1885 general election.

24. April 11 1883: RP 10080, 144.

The Privy Seal was vacant at the time and there was press speculation that Rosebery would be appointed. He did in fact get this post 2 years later when he joined the Cabinet.

25. June 6 1883: RP 10037, 88.

26. Crewe: Rosebery p. 225. See also: Magnusson et al: The Glorious Privilege pp. 72-3 for a letter from Chamberlain to Cooper outlining a "central board" for Scotland.

27. Crewe: Rosebery p. 242.

28. Speeches by the Right Hon the Earl of Rosebery (Edinburgh n.d.) pp. 14-16.

29. ibid pp. 27-35.

30. Coates: Rosebery pp. 454, 461, 469. It is curious to note how exactly Rosebery's speeches in 1885 echoed the actual words and phrases Gladstone had used in 1879.

31. RP 10037.

32. Arthur Ponsonby: Henry Ponsonby: Queen Victoria's Private Secretary, His Life from his Letters (London 1942) p. 260. This story is not specifically dated, but seems to refer to a dinner in 1886 or 1887.

33. March 26 1886: RP 10085, 120.

34. May 4 1886: RP 10017, 23.

35. June 11 1886: RP 10085, 224. Gladstone was obviously prepared to acknowledge Rosebery's special position in Scotland when it could be of use to him.

36. RP 10010, 92, 148, 156, 159. Magnusson et al: The Glorious Privilege p. 73.

37. May 23 1886: RP 10037, 149.

38. Crewe: Rosebery p. 299.

39. Lord Rosebery: Conciliation or Coercion: Which is the true Liberal Policy? A Speech Delivered to the Glasgow Junior Liberal Association (27 April 1887) (Edinburgh n.d.) pp. 4-5, 11-13, 22.

40. March 10 and April 14 1887: RP 10017, 52 and 66.

41. Crewe: Rosebery p. 325.

42. Hamilton Fyfe: T. P. O'Connor (London 1934) p. 157.

43. A Speech Delivered at Dalkeith by Lord Rosebery: November 1 1888 (Edinburgh n.d.) pp. 14-5.

44. R. B. Haldane: "The Liberal Creed": Contemporary Review, October 1888.

45. Crewe: Rosebery p. 339.

46. Richard Burdon Haldane: An Autobiography (London 1929) p. 82. Parnell was enjoying playing up to his own image here: he was certainly well aware of Froude's work and had quoted from one of his books, The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century, in his speech to the American Congress in 1880.

47. Crewe: Rosebery pp. 358-9.

48. January 7 and February 8 1890: RP 10176, 174 and 176.

49. D. A. Hamer: Liberal Politics in the Age of Gladstone and Rosebery: A Study in Leadership and Policy (Oxford 1972) p. 157.

50. Lord Rosebery: Pitt (London 1891) pp. 189, 193, 196-8, 200.

51. November 15 1898: RP 10131,

52. Lord Rosebery: "Statesmen and Bookmen": Presidential Address Delivered to the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution, November 25 1898 in: ed. John Buchan: Miscellanies Literary and Historical by Lord Rosebery (2 vols. London 1921), vol. 2, p. 225.

53. James: Rosebery p. 240.

54. ibid: p. 249.

55. Philip Magnus: Gladstone: A Biography (London 1954) p. 403.

56. James: Rosebery p. 275.

57. Hansard: April 7 1893, cols. 1760-1780.

58. Haldane Papers, National Library of Scotland (hereafter HP) Ms 5949, item 89.

59. June 7, July 21 and August 11 1893: HP 5949, 179; 5950, 35 and 5950, 70.

60. June 9 1893: HP 10020, 141 (typed copy from Royal Archives).

61. Lord Rosebery's Speeches: (1874-1896) (London 1896) pp. 97-8, 105, 108, 118, 125.

62. Samuel Henry Jeyes: The Earl of Rosebery (London 1906) pp. 177-8.

63. Crewe: Rosebery p. 431. Crewe loyally described Salisbury's comment as "hardly fair".

64. James: Rosebery p. 329.

65. Lord Rosebery: "Mr. Gladstone's Last Cabinet": A Memoir of Events Leading to his Accession to Prime Minister: History Today January 1952.

66. Coates: Rosebery p. 715.

67. Lord Rosebery's Speeches pp. 151-3, 155-6.

68. James: Rosebery p. 338. Rosebery's explanation must be seen as highly dubious to say the least.

69. Denis Gwynn: The Life of John Redmond (London 1932) pp. 83-4.

70. Lord Rosebery's Speeches pp. 161-9.

71. Hamer: Liberal Politics p. 260.

72. December 9 1894, January 3 1895 and May 2 1895: RP 10130, 69, 86-7 and 118.

73. RP 10147, 75.

74. Lord Rosebery's Speeches pp. 339-40, 348-9.

75. July 22 1895: RP 10131, 8.

76. July 27 1895: RP 10019, 1.

77. October 7 1896: RP 10019, 46.

78. October 6 1896: RP 10131, 105.

79. Coates: Rosebery pp. 849-90. James (Rosebery p. 396) gives a much more dramatic ending to the speech: "he ended on a characteristically dramatic note, by saying quietly that, as a Peer, he had no constituents; he had turned slightly away from the breathless audience, and, suddenly facing them, said 'But you, the people of Edinburgh, are my constituents', and sat down amid scenes of frenetic enthusiasm". Neither Coates, nor Lord Rosebery's Speeches, nor The Scotsman report, however (all of which give the speech in full), corroborate him by giving this ending.

80. James: Rosebery p. 396.

81. October 11 1896: HP 5955.

82. May 14 1896: RP 10056, 37. Sir Thomas Wemyss Reid 1842-1905 journalist and biographer; editor 1870-1887 Leeds Mercury; supporter initially of Gladstone and Home Rule, and then of Rosebery; founder and editor of The Speaker 1890-7; knighted 1894.

83. October 10 1895: RP 10050, 7. Sir Robert W. Perks 1849-1934; educated King's College London; lawyer; M.P. Louth 1892-1910; leading nonconformist spokesman and imperialist.

84. Coates: Rosebery pp. 889-890.

85. August 10 1895: RP 10131, 10. Ferguson tried belatedly to rebuild his career in the post-Rosebery party. He became Chairman of the Scottish Liberals Parliamentary Group and in 1910 joined the radicals in the Scottish Nationalist Committee, seconding the 1912 Scottish Home Rule Bill (see chapter 3). In 1913 Rosebery asked him to join him for a walk in Hyde Park. Ferguson, who was never noted for his tact, declined "as it might harm my political career". Rosebery, understandably, was furious. James: Rosebery p. 440.

86. Hansard: February 16 1898, col. 791.

See also: Haldane: Autobiography pp. 128-9.

Eric Ashby and Mary Anderson: Portrait of Haldane at Work on Education (London 1974) pp. 36-9, 59.

T. W. Moody: "The Irish University Question of the Nineteenth Century": History vol. XXIII 1958.

87. August 19 1896: HP 5904, 140.

88. February 4 1899: HP 10050, 81.

89. "The Irish University Question": Memorandum written by Mr. Haldane at the request of Mr. Arthur Balfour. HP 6108A, 5 pp. 3-4 (copy from Cabinet Papers).

90. Letters to his mother, October 11 and 12 1898: HP 5960, 66 and 68.

91. "Irish University Question" p. 18.

92. October 15 1898: HP 5960, 74.

93. November 17 1898: HP 5960, 118.

94. Letter to his mother: HP 5960, 126.

95. February 5 1899: HP 5904, 184.

96. R. B. Haldane: "Great Britain and Germany - A Study in Education": A Speech in Liverpool, October 1901 in: Education and Empire: Addresses on certain topics of the day (London 1902) pp. 35-8.

97. Haldane: "Constructive Liberalism".

98. Haldane: Autobiography pp. 133-4.

99. October 21 1899: RP 10131, 208.

100. February 25 1899: RP 10019, 105.

101. September 22 1900: RP 10050, 86.

102. Crewe: Rosebery p.568.

103. H. C. G. Matthew: The Liberal Imperialists: The Ideas and Politics of a Post-Gladstonian Elite (Oxford 1973) p. 56n.

104. September 1900: "To the Electors of East Lothian": Copy in HP 5905, 40.

105. Stephen Koss: Asquith (London 1976) p. 46.

106. Hammerton: Rosebery p. 160.

107. E. T. Raymond: The Man of Promise: Lord Rosebery A Critical Study (London 1923) p. 201.

108. ibid p. 202.

109. Lord Rosebery: National Policy: A Speech delivered at Chesterfield, December 16 1901 (London 1902) pp. 1-2.

110. James: Rosebery p. 433.

111. Crewe: Rosebery p. 573.

112. J. A. Spender: Life of the Right Hon. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman G.C.B. (2 vols. London 1923) vol. 2, p. 16.

113. James: Rosebery p. 436.

114. Crewe: Rosebery p. 573.

115. January 3 1902: HP 5905, 52.

116. February 28 1902: RP 10168, 85.

117. Liberal Principles and Prospects: and the Objects of the Liberal League. Two Speeches by Lord Rosebery ... with a Prefatory Note (London n.d.) pp. 11-3.

118. February 16 1902: HP 5905, 161.

119. February 18 1902 to Sir Edward Russell: RP 10131, 293.

120. Rosebery: Liberal Principles and Prospects p. 3.

121. See p. 182.

122. Hamer: Liberal Politics p. 265.

123. The Speaker, June 6 1903.

124. See RP 10168. Speech in Edinburgh November 1 1902: Administrative Efficiency, A Speech by Lord Rosebery (London n.d.).

125. RP 10168, 135.

126. Haldane: Constructive Liberalism, A Speech to the Eighty Club in Cambridge, March 12 1904 (London 1904).

127. Crewe: Rosebery p. 592.

128. The Times, November 27 1905.

129. James: Rosebery p. 454.

130. Crewe: Rosebery pp. 594-5.

131. James: Rosebery pp. 465 and 469.

132. Gwynn: Redmond p. 112.

133. March 26 1914 HP 5991, 107. Haig visit: Sir James Ferguson: The Curragh Incident (London 1964) p. 146.

134. Haldane: Autobiography pp. 266-7.

135. April 2 1914: HP 5991, 119.

FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER 6

1. Heuston: Lives of the Lord Chancellors pp. 313-344.

2. It was a tradition in Lynd's family that the minister's Scottish parishioners had objected to his wearing silver buckles on his shoes!

3. H. A. L. Fisher: James Bryce (London 1927) pp. 1-10, 283.

4. Hansard: May 21 1886, cols. 1691-2.

5. See, for example: vol. 172 1890, pp. 282-9; vol. 175 1892, pp. 557-585.

6. Kenneth Young: Arthur James Balfour: The Happy Life of the Politician Prime Minister Statesman and Philosopher 1848-1930 (London 1963) pp. 130-1.

7. Piers Brendon: Eminent Edwardians (London 1979) p. 70.

8. ed. Mrs. Edgar Dugdale: Arthur James First Earl of Balfour: Chapters of Autobiography (London 1930) p. 123.

9. A. J. Balfour: Mr. Gladstone's Scotch Speeches (Edinburgh 1880) p. 3. Balfour's own speech in Edinburgh dealt entirely with foreign policy.

10. Wolff, aged 49 in 1880, was M.P. for Portsmouth; before entering Parliament he had been a diplomat.

    Gorst, M.P. for Chatham, was 45; a lawyer by training, he had helped to establish the Conservative party machine in the early 1870s.

11. R. F. Foster: Lord Randolph Churchill: A Political Life (Oxford 1981) p. 71.

12. Young: Balfour p. 71.

13. See: Balfour to Salisbury, January 21 1881: Balfour Papers, British Library (hereafter BP) Add Ms 49688, item 41.

14. Hansard: May 16 1882, cols. 834-7 (reported in the third person).

15. Balfour: Autobiography p. 137.

    Blanche E. C. Dugdale: Arthur James Balfour: First Earl of Balfour, K.G., O.M., F.R.S., Etc (2 vols. London 1936) , vol. 1, pp. 61, 68.

16. S. H. Zebel: Balfour: A Political Biography (Cambridge 1973) p. 36.

17. Dugdale: Balfour, vol. 1, pp. 91-2.

18. Lord Salisbury's christian name was Robert.

19. Dugdale: Balfour, vol. 1, p. 110.

20. For a full account of the Crofters' Movement see: James Hunter: The Making of the Crofting Community (Edinburgh 1976) Chapters 8-10.

    BP Add Ms 49800 contains a file of letters on Balfour and the Crofters disturbances.

21. L. P. Curtis Junior: Coercion and Conciliation in Ireland: 1880-1892, A Study in Conservative Unionism (Princeton 1963) p. 175.

22. Young: Balfour p. 103.

23. His niece and official biographer records a conversation with him in 1928. They were discussing Balfour's early career, and when she asked him "What remains of your Irish policy?" he replied:

> Everything. Everything! Look at the position of Ulster now. That remained to us. And what was the Ireland that the Free State Government took over? The Ireland that we made. Why - even the Land Purchase Act which the Liberals stopped (that was a wicked thing they did) - even that had gone far enough to save the country. The Irish Government could have done nothing with Ireland but for our work.

    Dugdale: Balfour, vol. 2, p. 392.

24. T. P. O'Connor M.P.: The Parnell Movement: Being the History of the Irish Question from the Death of O'Connell to the Suicide of Pigott. (The "Commission" Edition London 1889) p. 306.

25. Michael J. F. McCarthy: Five Years in Ireland: 1895-1900 (6th. edition London 1901) p. 428.

    McCarthy had published a pamphlet extolling Balfour's work in 1891: Mr. Balfour's Rule in Ireland (Dublin 1891).

26. Michael J. F. McCarthy: Catholic Ireland and Protestant Scotland: A Contrast (Edinburgh 1905) pp. 13-14, 37.

27. Speaking in Haddington in 1902 when he was given the freedom of the burgh. Bernard Alderson: Arthur James Balfour: The Man and his Work (London 1903) p. 275.

See also: Margaret Digby: Horace Plunkett: An Anglo-American Irishman (Oxford 1949) p. 171.

28. E. T. Raymond: Mr. Balfour: A Biography (London 1920) p. 42.

29. Digby: Plunkett p. 171.

See also: L. P. Curtis Junior: Anglo-Saxons and Celts: A Study of Anti-Irish Prejudice in Victorian England (London 1968) pp. 63, 106.

30. Hansard: April 22 1893, col. 973. In the same speech he also said that Home Rule would mean the shattering of the constitution which represented "the slow consequence of the political sagacity of the Anglo-Saxon race" (col. 977).

31. Aspects of Home Rule: Selected from the Speeches of the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour M.P. (London 1912) p. 12.

32. See p. 29?

33. In: Curtis: Coercion and Conciliation

34. Dugdale: Balfour, vol. 1, p. 133.

Balfour's first speech: Hansard: March 22 1887, cols. 1174-1185.

Speech introducing the Crimes Act: Hansard: March 28 1887, cols. 1624-1658. Parnell, Dillon, Sexton, Tanner, Harrington, Kenny and both the Redmonds provided the interruptions.

35. Dugdale: Balfour, vol. 1, p. 132.

36. See letters from Balfour to Sir Redvers Buller, permanent Under-Secretary, June 11 and August 12 1887: BP Add Ms 49826, 61 and 132.

37. Dugdale: Balfour, vol. 1, p. 147.

38. October 14 1887. Copy in the Balfour Papers, Whittingehame, East Lothian; available through the Scottish Record Office, reference TD 83/133 (hereafter BPW) File 33.

39. Edward Marjoribanks: The Life of Lord Carson (vol. 1 London 1932) p. 100.

40. BPW File 32.

41. Curtis: Coercion and Conciliation pp. 190-221.

42. Alderson: Balfour p. 78.

43. Balfour, while concerned about the effect Mandeville's death might have politically, was predictably relaxed: "We cannot hope that everybody sent to an Irish prison will prove immortal; and if this kind of agitation is to be repeated every time that some ex-prisoner goes the way of all flesh, it may have a bad effect". Letter to Ridgeway, July 13 1888: BP Add Ms 49827, 63.

44. Conybeare also claimed that he had been given sheets filthy with "emissions of semen" from previous inmates. There is a file of letters dealing with the subject at exhaustive length in: BPW File 66.

See also: Balfour to Ridgeway, July 26 1890: "That brute Conybeare kept us up till 3 o'clock last night over his experiences...." BP Add Ms 49829, 66.

45. Young: Balfour p. 110.

Dugdale: Balfour, vol. 1, p. 148.

46. Elizabeth Longford: A Pilgrimage of Passion: The Life of Wilfrid Scawen Blunt (paperback edition London 1982) p. 247.

As well as knowing him socially, Balfour may have come across Blunt when the latter was providing information for Randolph Churchill on Egypt, his other great passion, in 1883. If so, he would already have accustomed himself not to take Blunt too seriously: Foster: Lord Randolph Churchill p. 111.

47. Salisbury to Balfour, September 20 1888 and Balfour to Ridgeway June 20 1888: BP Add Ms 49689, 33.

48. Balfour to Ridgeway, July 10 1888: BP Add Ms 49827, 53.

49. Dugdale: Balfour, col. 1, p. 162.

50. The fact that Balfour had done so was confirmed by revelations by William Henry Joyce, former R.I.C. Inspector and R.M. who turned nationalist. See: Leon O Broin: The Prime Informer: A Suppressed Scandal (British edition London 1971).

See also a letter from Ridgeway to Gerald Balfour, April 12 1896 on Joyce's change of allegiance: "Joyce is no doubt in league with the Nationalists who would of course rejoice to have the opportunity of reviving the question of the complicity of Government with the 'Times'". BPW File 126.

51. Alderson: Balfour p. 71.

52. F. S. L. Lyons: "The Economic Ideas of Parnell" in Historical Studies.

53. Parnell: vol. 150, June 1890, pp. 665-670.

Balfour: vol. 150, July 1890, pp. 1-13.

54. vol. 155, December 1892, pp. 641-651.

55. BP Add Ms 49845, 244-255.

56. Curtis: Coercion and Conciliation p. 329.

57. Calderwood was Professor of Moral Philosophy. He had been Chairman of the Edinburgh School Board, was a keen advocate of temperance, and, before 1886, had been spoken of as a possible Liberal M.P. Quasi Cursores: Portraits of the High Officers and Professors of the University of Edinburgh at its Tercentenary Festival (Edinburgh 1884) pp. 67-9.

58. Quasi Cursores pp. 52-3.

59. The proceedings of both the banquet and the mass meeting are reported in full in ed. Alfred Woodrow Sansome: Commemorative Record of the Scottish National Demonstration in Honour of the Right Honourable Arthur James Balfour M.P. Chief Secretary for Ireland (Edinburgh 1890).

60. October 30 1891: Records of the University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Library.

61. Balfour to Principal Sir William Muir, April 9 1891 (expressing gratification that the lectures had been so received) ibid.

62. Owen Dudley Edwards: The Quest for Sherlock Holmes: A Biographical Study of Arthur Conan Doyle (Edinburgh 1983) pp. 178-180.

A. Campbell Fraser was Professor of Logic and Metaphysics. Like Calderwood, he was a Liberal Unionist, having been editor of the Liberal North British Review 1850-7. Quasi Cursores pp. 59-61.

63. Sir Ian Malcolm: Lord Balfour: A Memory (London 1930) p. 29.

The Irish nationalist M.P. Thomas Kettle believed that Balfour had been captured by the Tariff Reformers, and provided a variant aphorism on the same theme: "They have nailed their leader to the mast". Thomas Kettle: The Day's Burden: and Other Essays (reprint Dublin 1968) p. 30.

64. BPW File 32.

Marjoribanks: Carson p. 148.

65. Balfour outlined this approach in a speech in London just before the opening of the committee stage of the Bill, May 7 1893: Aspects of Home Rule pp. 145-163.

66. ibid: pp. 24-7.

67. In one speech he did also criticise the financial arrangements proposed: "Ireland, under the Bill, can only remain solvent so long as she is drunk. Irish sobriety would be followed by Irish bankruptcy with absolute certainty under the provisions of this measure; for her sole, substantial resource is excise". ibid: p. 30.

68. Dugdale: Balfour, vol. 1, p. 209.

69. From a 5 page manuscript description of the day by his sister, Alice, who accompanied Balfour. BPW File 69.

See also: Ramsay Colles: The History of Ulster: From the Earliest Times to the Present Day (4 vols. London 1919), vol. 4. p. 223.

70. Mary Leslie to Alice Balfour, n.d.: BPW File 32.

71. Alderson: Balfour pp. 125-6.

72. Aspects of Home Rule p. 51.

73. ibid: p. 71.

74. ibid: pp. 110, 137.

75. BPW File 69. Devonshire was the Liberal Unionist leader Hartington who had succeeded his father as Duke of Devonshire in 1891.

76. The Scottish Review and Christian Leader, March 28 1907.

77. Dugdale: Balfour, vol. 2, pp. 61, 72-78, 96-103.

Aspects of Home Rule pp. 1-20.

A. J. Balfour: Nationality and Home Rule (London 1913).

The Policy of the Unionist Party: A Speech Delivered by the Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour at Nottingham on November 17 1910 (London 1910).

78. The Earl of Midleton: Ireland: Dupe or Heroine (London 1932) pp. xi-xii.

FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER 7

1. Robert Blake: The Unknown Prime Minister: The Life and Times of Andrew Bonar Law 1858-1923 (London 1955) p. 97.

2. Bonar Law Papers, House of Lords Record Office (hereafter B.L.P.) Box 27, Folder 4, item 7 and Box 28, Folder 1, item 109.

3. For example, Balfour writing to Bonar Law in December 1911: "You seem to me to have done quite admirably since you took the reins ..." B.L.P. 24, 5, 146.

4. Rowland: Last Liberal Governments, vol. 2, pp. 79-80.

5. B.L.P. Arthur Steel-Maitland (1876-1935) educated at Oxford, where he was President of the Union; fellow of All Souls; Conservative M.P. 1910-1935; Chairman of the Conservative Party; Under-Secretary for the Colonies 1915-7; Under-Secretary for the Foreign Office 1917-9; Minister of Labour 1924-9.

6. B.L.P. 24, 3, 21.

7. B.L.P. 24, 3, 36; 26, 1, 58; 26, 4, 18; 25, 1, 53; 25, 2, 48; 25, 3, 10; 25, 3, 13; 27, 3, 12; 29, 5, 24.

8. B.L.P. 25, 2, 8.

9. B.L.P. 25, 3, 47 and 28, 1, 39.

10. Magnusson et al: The Glorious Privilege pp. 86-8.

11. B.L.P. 24, 3, 28.

12. B.L.P. 28, 1, 109. The Scotsman published a leader on the subject the same day as Croal wrote to Bonar Law: December 31 1912.

13. B.L.P. 30, 3, 44.

14. B.L.P. 27, 4, 7.

15. B.L.P. 30, 3, 59 and 73. For Carson's meeting in Dundee see: Ian Colvin: The Life of Lord Carson (vol. 2, London 1934) pp. 231-2 and The Scotsman, November 8 1913.

16. The Times, January 27 1912.

17. The Times, April 10 1912.

18. Hansard: April 16 1912, cols. 285-301.

19. B.L.P. 27, 3, 6 and 33, 4, 57.

20. B.L.P. 33, 3, 23.

21. B.L.P. 33, 3, 18.

22. Blake: The Unknown Prime Minister p. 135.

23. The Times, July 29 1912.

24. Rowland: Last Liberal Governments, vol. 2, p. 176.

25. As an alternative Law suggested, that if the Government felt that an election could not in the nature of things be fought on this issue alone, he would accept a referendum.

26. B.L.P. 33, 5, 20 and 35.

27. The Times, October 30 1913.

28. B.L.P. 30, 2, 20; 30, 2, 21; 30, 2, 37.

29. B.L.P. 33, 5, 67.

30. The Times, January 16 1914.

31. B.L.P. 31, 3, 2.

32. Speaking in Dublin. The Times, November 29 1913. The reference, of course, was to James VII and II and is further evidence of the debt of Bonar Law to his Ulster heritage.

33. Hansard: March 9 1914, cols. 918-926.

34. Reprinted in: John Buchan: Homilies and Recreations (London 1926) p. 135.

35. John Buchan: Lord Rosebery (Oxford n.d.) p. 18.

36. John Buchan: Memory Hold-the-Door (London 1940) p. 30.

37. Janet Adam Smith: John Buchan: A Biography (London 1965).

38. Buchan has not always been well served by those who have sought to write about his books:

Richard Usborne: Clubland Heroes: A Nostalgic Study of some Recurrent Characters in the Romantic Fiction of Dornford Yates, John Buchan and Sapper (London 1953). The title of this book really speaks for itself, and while it is harmless enough, there is more to be said of Buchan's fiction than of Yates' or Sapper's.

David Daniell: The Interpreter's House: A Critical Assessment of the Work of John Buchan (London 1975). This work goes the other way. Daniell works hard, too hard, to establish that Buchan was a great writer, and to explain away the tendencies to anti-Semitism in some of the books.

William Buchan: John Buchan: A Memoir (London 1982). This otherwise attractive study by his son suffers from the same problem as Daniell's book. Both authors would have done better to admit the anti-Semitism, and point out that Buchan made amends in his later work.

39. Unless it be in the fact that they provoked George Douglas Brown's The House with the Green Shutters. Smith: Buchan p. 87.

40. Buchan: Memory Hold-the-Door p. 81.

41. In: The Book of the Horace Club: 1898-1901 (Oxford 1901). A volume of verse by the friends who founded this Oxford club.

42. Reviewing A. P. Graves in The Spectator, October 10 1908 p. 543. These strictures were not directed against Graves, whose work Buchan admired.

43. The Spectator, March 12 1904, pp. 416-7.

44. February 21 1907.

45. May 30 1907.

46. April 9 1908.

47. November 21 1907; December 26 1907.

48. October 8 1908.

49. December 1909, pp. 857-869.

50. March 1910, p. 435.

51. William Buchan: Buchan p. 132 suggests that he did, and lost.

52. Smith: Buchan p. 183.

53. The Spectator, October 14 1911, p. 581.

54. Smith: Buchan p. 184.

The Scotsman, December 19 1912.

55. Alice Buchan: A Scrap Screen (London 1979) p. 149.

56. John Buchan: The Three Hostages (pocket edition Nelson London n.d.) p. 179.

57. John Buchan: Mr. Standfast (pocket edition Nelson London 1961) pp. 58-9.

FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER 8

1. The Fortnightly Review, vol. 49, 1891.

2. Hugh MacDiarmid: Scottish Eccentrics (London 1936) p. 229.

   See also: F. S. L. Lyons: Ireland Since the Famine (paperback edition London 1973) p. 224n.

3. For general studies of Geddes and Sharp, see:

   Paddy Kitchen: A Most Unsettling Person: An Introduction to the Ideas and Life of Patrick Geddes (London 1975).

   Philip Boardman: Patrick Geddes: Maker of the Future (London 1944).

   Elizabeth Sharp: William Sharp: A Memoir (London 1910).

   Flavia Alaya: William Sharp-"Fiona Macleod" (Cambridge Massachussetts 1970).

4. Patrick Geddes Papers, National Library of Scotland (hereafter GP); Ms 10563, item 1.

5. William Sharp Papers, National Library of Scotland (hereafter SP); Ms 8784. (A bound volume containing all the obituaries and press notices of Sharp's death.)

6. Holbrook Jackson: The Eighteen Nineties: A Review of Art and Ideas at the Close of the Nineteenth Century (reprint London 1931) p. 42.

7. James Thorpe: English Illustration: The Nineties (London 1935) p. 195.

8. Kitchen: Most Unsettling Person p. 151.

9. December 1895.

10. Sharp: William Sharp p. 226.

11. Arranged by Mrs. William Sharp: The Uniform Edition of the Works of Fiona Macleod (7 vols. London 1910-1912) (hereafter Uniform Edtn.), vol. 2, p. 10.

12. Sharp: William Sharp p. 256.

13. GP Ms 10563, 30. (Typed copies of the reviews sent to Geddes by Sharp.)

14. Francis Russell Hart: The Scottish Novel: A Critical Survey (London 1978) p. 342.

15. Alaya: Sharp-"Macleod" p. 151.

16. April 27 1895: GP Ms 10563, 9.

17. W. M. Parker: Modern Scottish Writers (Edinburgh 1917) p. 61.

18. October 1895.

19. It would seem likely that Yeats published a review of the book somewhere, but I have found no trace of one.

20. Sharp: William Sharp pp. 268, 271-2.

21. December 1896.

22. Sharp: William Sharp p. 276.

Elizabeth Sharp describes this letter as sent to her husband under his own name, which would clearly indicate that Yeats knew Fiona Macleod's identity. This, however, must be a slip on her part, for it is obvious that Yeats did not. The letters in Yeats' papers show that Sharp took the trouble to use completely different handwriting for his 2 personae. Sharp also wrote the following letter with instructions that Yeats should be given it on Sharp's death:

"You will think that I have deceived you about Fiona Macleod. But, in absolute privacy, I tell you I have not, howsoever in certain details I have (inevitably) misled you. Only, it is a mystery. Perhaps you will instinctively understand, or may come to understand. 'The rest is silence'. Farewell. WILLIAM SHARP. It is only right, however, to add that I, and I only, am the author - in the literal and literary sense - of all written under the name of Fiona Macleod".

Joseph Hone: W. B. Yeats: 1865-1939 (London 1942) p. 482.

23. Sharp: William Sharp p. 277.

24. ibid: pp. 280-1.

25. Lyons: Ireland Since the Famine p. 238.

26. Letter to his wife: Sharp: William Sharp p. 288.

27. Geddes to J. Arthur Thompson, August 12 1896: GP Ms 10588, 72.

28. Lack of money, see: GP Ms 10563.

Attempted sale to Murray: Kitchen: Most Unsettling Person pp. 150, 153.

29. GP Ms 10563, 72.

30. Ireland did feature once more in Geddes' career. In 1910 and 1914 he mounted exhibitions in Dublin on the theme of urban renewal. He had been invited over by Lord Aberdeen, the Viceroy, to examine the appalling housing conditions of much of Dublin's working class. Geddes was much excited by the prospect of working in Dublin, which, in a splendidly Geddesian phrase, he described as "the geotechnic capital of the British Isles". Prompted by Aberdeen, Dublin Corporation promised a large plot of land just outside the city where Geddes could plan and build a model garden city. The plan was abandoned, being unable to compete with the 1913 Lock-Out and then the War for public attention. See: GP Ms 10556, 302.

    Boardman: Patrick Geddes pp. 320-1.

    Kitchen: Most Unsettling Person pp. 328-350.

    Lord and Lady Aberdeen: "We Twa" (2 vols. London 1925) vol. 2, pp. 185-190.

31. Sharp: William Sharp pp. 304-5.

32. July 1899.

33. Sharp: William Sharp p. 309.

34. ibid: p. 310.

35. For an account of the Stage Society production, see: Sharp: William Sharp pp. 317-8.

    The 2 plays were published in July and November 1900.

36. Uniform Edtn. vol. 5, pp. 192-5.

37. Ms review, signed "Fiona Macleod": SP Ms 8777, 77. Publication, if any, not traced.

38. September 1894: SP Ms 8783, 2.

39. Uniform Edtn. vol. 4, p. 245.

40. May 31 1900.

41. May 3 1900.

42. David W. Miller: Church, State and Nation in Ireland: 1898-1921 (Pittsburgh 1973) pp. 40-1.

43. Sharp: William Sharp p. 321.

44. 4 October 1901.

45. ibid: 16 October 1904; 17 January 1905; 25 January 1908.

46. Uniform Edtn. vol. 5, pp. 226-7.

"a few learned men (mostly German)" was presumably principally a reference to Kuno Meyer.

47. Uniform Edtn. vol. 5, p. 321.

48. Uniform Edtn. vol. 7, p. 100.

49. Sharp: William Sharp pp. 334-6.

50. Uniform Edtn. vol. 5, pp. 303-4.

51. February 18 1904: SP Ms 8783, 30.

52. Uniform Edtn. vol. 5, pp. 167-177.

The Irish authoress Ethel Goddard reviewing The Winged Destiny, while generally praising the book, denounced: "that vulgar indolence of cosmopolitanism which excuses its ignorance of the traditions of any one country by an affectation of admiration for all countries". Alaya: Sharp-"Macleod" pp. 171, 207.

53. Millar: Literary History of Scotland p. 662.

FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER 9

1. John Connell: W. E. Henley (London 1949) p. 49.

2. The Times, June 9 1885.

3. ed. S. Colvin: The Works of Robert Louis Stevenson: Tusitala Edition (35 vols. London 1923-4), vol. 3: The Dynamiter p. xii.

4. ed. S. Colvin: The Letters of Robert Louis Stevenson (new edition 4 vols. London 1911), vol. 2, p. 44.

5. G. A. Hayes-McCoy: "Robert Louis Stevenson and the Irish Question": Studies vol. XXXIX (1950) p. 132.

6. ed. Colvin: Letters of Stevenson, vol. 2, pp. 315-9.

7. J. A. Steuart: Robert Louis Stevenson: Man and Writer (London 1924), vol. 2, p. 85.

8. R. L. Stevenson: Edinburgh: Picturesque Notes (illustrated edition London 1912) pp. 44, 72.

9. Much of the correspondence is in the National Library of Scotland: Adv. Ms 26.8.1.

10. May 25 1889: vol. 2, p. 11.

11. Connell: Henley. This basically very good biography of Henley plays down and faintly ridicules the Scottish aspects of the paper.

    J. H. Buckley: William Ernest Henley: A Study in the Counter-Decadence of the Nineties (Princeton 1945). This book is worse in this regard: Buckley refers to the periodical as the National Observer throughout.

    The additional point that Henley, though certainly an Englishman, would have been well aware of distinctively Scottish outlooks on many subjects through the time he had spent in Edinburgh, and not least through his friendship with Stevenson, also evades these authors.

12. ed. Roger Lancelyn Green: Kipling: The Critical Heritage (London 1971) pp. 201-2.

    Another Scottish critic, while also paying tribute to the importance of "Cleared", viewed it in a very different light. Robert Buchanan had caused a considerable flutter in literary circles in 1871 for his attack on Rosetti, graphically entitled "The Fleshly School of Poetry". In 1899 he published another article which roused controversy: a study of Kipling which also had a memorable title: "The Voice of the

Hooligan". In it, he had this to say of "Cleared": "Mr. Kipling spits all the venom of cockney ignorance on the Irish party, apropos of a certain Commission of which we have all heard, and, while saying nothing on the subject of forged letters and cowardly accusations, affirms that Irish patriots are naturally and distinctively murderers, because in the name of patriotism murders have now and then been done. He who loves blood and gore so much, who cannot even follow the soldier home into our streets without celebrating his drunken assaults and savageries, has only hate and loathing for the unhappy nation which has suffered untold wrong, and which, when all is said and done, has struck back so seldom". ibid: p. 240.

For the circumstances surrounding the publication of "Cleared" in the Scots Observer, see: Connell: Henley pp. 172-3.

13. June 1 1889: vol. 2, p. 35.

14. December 29 1888: vol. 1, p. 150.

15. July 19 1890: vol. 4, p. 215.

16. February 2 1889: vol. 1, p. 292.

17. December 15 1888: vol. 1, p. 93.

18. February 2 1889: vol. 1, p. 290.

19. The Scotsman, April 22 1889.

20. April 27 1889: vol. 1, p. 630.

21. The Scotsman, May 1 1889.

22. ibid: May 12 1889.

23. May 25 1889: vol. 2, p. 4. The reference of course is to Pi[illegible]ott.

24. July 13 1889: vol. 2, p. 207.

25. The Scotsman, July 20 1889.

26. February 1 1890: vol. 3, p. 286. The west of Ireland was at the time suffering from extreme agrarian distress bordering on famine.

27. August 3 1889: vol. 2, p. 281.

28. November 23 1889: vol. 3, p. 3.

29. It is possible that Hamilton Bruce also attended, as well as Baxter and Bell. ed. Sansome: Commemorative Record of the Scottish National Demonstration includes "Robert Bruce, Edinburgh" in its "List of Gentlemen Present at the Banquet" (p. 121).

30. December 7 1889: vol. 3, p. 57.

31. Land Purchase, see: vol. 2, pp. 369, 396.
vol. 3, pp. 118, 461, 506, 648.
vol. 4, pp. 16, 19.

Russell's later contributions, see for examples: vol. 4, pp. 381, 421, 497.

32. September 27 1890: vol. 4, p. 485.

33. June 28 1890: vol. 4, p. 150.

34. Wilde controversy, see: vol. 4, pp. 181, 201, 226, 253, 279, 303, 332, 356, 384, 410.

35. Connell: Henley pp. 187-194. Connell finds the whole episode more sinister. He argues that Henley's friend Charles Whibley, who wrote the original review, was indirectly attacking Wilde's own private life. This is quite possible: Whibley, a London based art critic and journalist, might well have been hearing things about Wilde. On the simple evidence of the articles and letters in the Observer, however, it is not possible to view the affair in this light.

FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER 10

1. Michael Hechter: Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966 (London 1975). Hechter's book is wide-ranging and stimulating. However, his conclusions on Scottish society in the late nineteenth century seem to the present writer profoundly misconceived and are considerably at variance to those advanced in this chapter. Hechter would seem to be arguing that the Scots, and the other Celtic nations (in which he appears to include Northern Ireland) are to be seen only in terms of either becoming anglicised or pressed down to the status of a subordinate people.

2. Curtis: Anglo-Saxons and Celts.

3. Brown incidentally was of Irish descent on his mother's side. James Veitch: George Douglas Brown (London 1952) p. 6.

4. William Archer: Study and Stage (London 1899).

   Poets of the Younger Generation (London 1902).

   Real Conversations (London 1904).

   The Old Drama and the New (London 1923).

5. Denis Mackail: The Story of J.M.B.: A Biography (London 1941) pp. 567-8.

6. Andrew Lang: The Life, Letters and Diaries of Sir Stafford Northcote: First Earl of Iddesleigh (2 vols. Edinburgh 1890).

   Roger Lancelyn Green: Andrew Lang: A Critical Biography pp. 182-3.

7. ed. Andrew Lang: The Annesley Case (Edinburgh 1912).

8. Peter Green: Kenneth Grahame: 1859-1932 A Study of his Life, Work and Times (London 1959) p. 108.

9. St. James Gazette, November 19 1890. Reproduced in full in: Green: Grahame pp. 109-110.

   "the old Waterspout" is of course a reference to Gladstone.

10. ed. Knox: Scottish Labour Leaders pp. 274-284. See also: the entries for Joseph Dollan, William Gallacher, John McGovern and Joseph Sullivan.

11. Alexander Wardrop: Mid-Cauther Fair: With other Poems, Songs and Prose Sketches (Glasgow n.d.) pp. 132-6, 175-182.

12. Hugh MacDiarmid: Scottish Eccentrics (London 1936) p. 291.

Compton Mackenzie: Catholicism and Scotland (London 1936) pp. 183-5.

H. J. Paton: The Claim of Scotland (London 1968) pp. 177-180.

13. H. J. Hanham: "The Creation of the Scottish Office, 1881-87": Juridical Review 1965 pp. 217-8.

14. T. W. H. Crosland: The Unspeakable Scot (London 1902) pp. 191-2, 197.

15. J. M. Barrie: What Every Woman Knows (London 1908), Acts I and II.

16. Lord and Lady Aberdeen: "We Twa".

More Cracks with "We Twa" (London 1929).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. PRIMARY SOURCES

A. Manuscript

Minute Books of the Scottish Liberal Party, University of Edinburgh Library.

Records of the University of Edinburgh, University of Edinburgh Library.

Collections of papers of individuals:

1. Arthur James Balfour, British Library.

2. Arthur James Balfour and Gerald Balfour, Whittingehame, East Lothian: available through the Scottish Record Office.

3. Andrew Bonar Law, House of Lords Record Office.

4. Patrick Geddes, National Library of Scotland.

5. R. B. Cunninghame Graham, National Library of Scotland.

6. Richard Burdon Haldane, National Library of Scotland.

7. J. Keir Hardie, National Library of Scotland.

8. 5th Earl of Rosebery, National Library of Scotland.

9. William Sharp, National Library of Scotland.

10. Robert Louis Stevenson, National Library of Scotland.

B. Newspapers and Periodicals

Blackwoods Magazine.

The Bookman.

The Contemporary Review.

The Daily Review (Edinburgh).

The Dundee Advertiser.

The Edinburgh Review.

The Evening News (Edinburgh).

The Evergreen.

The Fiery Cross.

The Fortnightly Review.

The Glasgow Examiner.

The Glasgow Herald.

The Glasgow Observer.

The Houyhnhnm.

The Labour Leader.

The North American Review.

The North British Daily Mail.

Saint Andrew.

The St. James Gazette.

The Saturday Review.

Scotia.

The Scots Magazine (and supplement 1890-1 The British Federalist).

The Scotsman.

The Scots Observer.

The Scottish Nation.

The Scottish Nationalist.

The Scottish Patriot.

The Scottish Review.

The Scottish Review and Christian Leader.

The Speaker.

The Spectator.

The Thistle.

The Times.

C. Other Printed Material

Lord and Lady Aberdeen: "We Twa": Reminiscences (2 vols. London 1925).

Lord and Lady Aberdeen: More Cracks with "We Twa" (London 1929).

William Archer: The Old Drama and the New (London 1923).

William Archer: Poets of the Younger Generation (London 1902).

William Archer: Real Conversations (London 1904).

William Archer: Study and Stage (London 1899).

A. J. Balfour: Aspects of Home Rule: Selected from the Speeches of ... (London 1912).

A. J. Balfour: Chapters of Autobiography (ed. Mrs. E. Dugdale) (London 1930).

A. J. Balfour: The Constitutional Question: A Speech by ... to the members of the Primrose League in London on May 11 1911 (London 1911).

A. J. Balfour: Mr. Gladstone's Scotch Speeches (Edinburgh 1880).

A. J. Balfour: Nationality and Home Rule (London 1913).

A. J. Balfour: The Policy of the Unionist Party: A Speech Delivered by ... at Nottingham on November 17 1910 (London 1910).

J. M. Barrie: An Edinburgh Eleven: Pencil Portraits from College Life (London 1889).

J. M. Barrie: The Plays of ... (London 1928).

W. S. Blunt: My Diaries: Being a Personal Narrative of Events 1888-1914 (2 vols. London 1919-20).

John Buchan: Homilies and Recreations (London 1926).

John Buchan: Lord Rosebery (Oxford n.d.).

John Buchan: Memory Hold-the-Door (London 1940).

John Buchan: Mr. Standfast (reprint London 1961).

John Buchan: The Three Hostages (reprint London n.d.).

The Marquess of Bute: Parliament in Scotland (Edinburgh n.d.).

G. B. Clark: A Plea for the Nationalisation of the Land (London n.d.).

James Connolly: Selected Political Writings (ed. Owen Dudley Edwards and Bernard Ransom) (New York 1974).

Joseph Conrad: Letters to R. B. Cunninghame Graham (ed. C. T. Watts) (Cambridge 1969).

Charles A. Cooper: An Editor's Retrospect: Fifty Years of Newspaper Work (London 1896).

T. W. H. Crosland: The Unspeakable Scot (London 1902).

T. W. H. Crosland: The Wild Irishman (London 1905).

Dod's Parliamentary Companion (London issued annually).

George Douglas: The House with the Green Shutters (London 1901).

Sir Arthur Conan Doyle: Memories and Adventures (London 1924).

Robert Farquaharson: The House of Commons from Within: and Other Memories (London 1912).

In and Out of Parliament: Reminiscences of a Varied Life (London 1911).

R. B. Finlay: The Government of Ireland Bill (London 1886).

Patrick Geddes editor: The Interpreter (Edinburgh 1896).

W. E. Gladstone: The Irish Question (London 1886).

R. B. Cunninghame Graham: Brought Forward (London 1915).

Charity (London 1912).

Faith (London 1909).

A Hatchment (London 1913).

His People (London 1906).

Hope (London 1910).

The Imperial Kailyard: Being a Biting Satire on English Colonisation (London 1896).

The Ipane (London 1899).

Notes on the District of Menteith: for Tourists and Others (London 1895).

R. B. Cunninghame Graham: Progress: And Other Sketches (London 1905).
(cont'd.)

Success (London 1902).

Thirteen Stories (London 1900).

G. and R. B. Cunninghame Graham: Father Archangel of Scotland: And Other Essays (London 1896).

R. B. Haldane: An Autobiography (London 1929).

Constructive Liberalism: A Speech at the Eighty Club in Cambridge (London 1904).

Education and Empire (London 1902).

Selected Addresses and Essays (London 1828).

Universities and National Life (London 1910).

Hansard.

Frank Harris: My Life and Loves (one vol. paperback edtn. London 1966).

William Harvey: Irish Life and Humour: In Anecdote and Story (Stirling n.d.).

Scottish Life and Character: In Anecdote and Story (Stirling n.d.).

Ian Hay: The Oppressed English (London 1918).

The Book of the Horace Club: 1898-1901 (Oxford 1901).

W. A. Hunter: The Financial Relations of England and Scotland (Edinburgh 1892).

Thomas Johnston: Memories (London 1952).

Thomas Kettle: The Day's Burden: And Other Essays (reprint Dublin 1968).

George Lancaster: The Landlord and Home Rule Questions: Considered on Political Grounds and Tested by Christian Principles (Edinburgh 1891).

Andrew Lang: Essays in Little (London 1891).

Life, Letters and Diaries of Sir Stafford Northcote: First Earl of Iddesleigh (2 vols. Edinburgh 1890).

(editor) The Annesley Case (Edinburgh 1912).

David Lowe: Souvenirs of Scottish Labour (Glasgow 1919).

Robert Lynd: Essays on Life and Literature (reprint London 1951).

Lyra Celtica: An Anthology of Representative Celtic Poetry: ed. E. A. Sharp and J. Matthay (Edinburgh 1896).

A Series of Letters on Scottish Home Rule between the Most Noble the Marquis of Lorne and John Romans Esq of Newton Grange (Edinburgh n.d.).

Michael J. F. McCarthy: Catholic Ireland and Protestant Scotland: A Contrast (Edinburgh 1905).

Five Years in Ireland: 1895-1900 (London 1901).

Mr. Balfour's Rule in Ireland (Dublin 1891).

Priests and People in Ireland (Dublin 1902).

B. D. MacKenzie: Home Rule for Scotland: Why Should Scotland Wait? (Edinburgh n.d.).

Compton Mackenzie: Catholicism and Scotland (London 1936).

Echoes (London 1953).

My Life and Times: Octaves 1-4 (London 1963-5).

The Uniform Edition of the Works of Fiona Macleod ed. Mrs. William Sharp (7 vols. London 1910-12).

The Earl of Midleton: Ireland: Dupe or Heroine (London 1932).

J. H. Millar: A Literary History of Scotland (London 1903).

William Mitchell: Home Rule for Scotland (Paisley 1889).

Home Rule for Scotland and Imperial Federation (Edinburgh 1892).

Scotland and Home Rule (Edinburgh 1888).

Theodore Napier: Scotland's Demand for Home Rule: An Appeal to Scotsmen in Australia (Melbourne 1892).

William Robertson Nicoll: A Bookman's Letters (London 1913).

William Robertson Nicoll: The Life of John Watson (London 1908).
(cont'd)

People and Books (London 1926).

T. P. O'Connor M.P.: The Parnell Movement: Being the History of the Irish Question from the Death of O'Connell to the Suicide of Pigott. (The "Commission" edition London 1889).

D. J. O'Donoghue: The Life and Writings of James Clarence Mangan (Edinburgh 1886).

Frederick Scott Oliver: The Alternatives to Civil War (London 1913).

Federalism and Home Rule (London 1910).

What Federalism is Not (London 1914).

W. M. Parker: Modern Scottish Writers (Edinburgh 1917).

Quasi Cursores: Portraits of the High Officers and Professors of the University of Edinburgh at its Tercentenary Festival (Edinburgh 1884).

Andrew Reid editor: The New Party: Described by Some of its Members (popular edtn. London 1895).

Lord Rosebery: Administrative Efficiency: A Speech by ... (London n.d.).

Conciliation or Coercion: Which is the True Liberal Policy? A Speech Delivered to the Glasgow Junior Liberal Association on April 27 1887 (Edinburgh n.d.).

Liberal Principles and Prospects: and the Objects of the Liberal League (London n.d.).

Lord Rosebery's Speeches: 1874-1896 (London 1896).

"Mr. Gladstone's Last Cabinet": History Today January 1952.

Miscellanies: Literary and Historical (ed. John Buchan) (2 vols. London 1921).

National Policy: A Speech Delivered at Chesterfield December 16 1901 (London 1902).

Pitt (London 1891).

Lord Rosebery: (cont'd) A Speech Delivered at Dalkeith by ...: November 1 1888 (Edinburgh n.d.).

Speeches by the Right Hon. the Earl of Rosebery (Edinburgh n.d.).

S. Rosenbaum editor: Against Home Rule: The Case for the Union (London 1912).

ed. A. W. Sansome: Commemorative Record of the Scottish National Demonstration in Honour of the Right Honourable Arthur James Balfour M.P. (Edinburgh 1890).

Scotland's Welcome to Mr. Parnell: A Souvenir of His First Political Visit to Scotland (Edinburgh 1889).

Scottish Home Rule Association: Memorandum by the Scottish Home Rule Association with Reference to the Scottish Grand Committee to be Proposed (Edinburgh n.d.).

Scottish Versus Irish Grievances (Edinburgh n.d.).

The Union of 1707 Viewed Financially (Edinburgh n.d.).

The Bodley Head Bernard Shaw Collected Plays with their Prefaces (7 vols. London 1971-4).

Robert Louis Stevenson: The Body-Snatcher (New York 1895).

Edinburgh: Picturesque Notes (illustrated edition London 1912).

The Letters of ... ed. Sidney Colvin (new edition, 4 vols. London 1911).

The Master of Ballantrae (London 1888).

Memories and Portraits (London 1887).

R. L. Stevenson with Fanny Van de Grift Stevenson: The Dynamiter (London 1885).

R. L. Stevenson with Lloyd Osbourne: The Wrecker (London 1892).

Charles Waddie: Historical Lessons on Home Rule (Edinburgh 1887).

Charles Waddie: (cont'd) Report on the Debate in the House of Commons: on Dr. G. B. Clark's Motion in favour of Home Rule for Scotland (Edinburgh 1893).

Report on the Debate in the House of Commons: on Mr. Dalziel's Motion in favour of Home Rule for Scotland (Edinburgh 1894).

T. D. Wanliss: A Colonial View of Home Rule (Dundee 1890).

Bars to British Unity (Edinburgh 1895).

Alexander Wardrop: Mid-Cauther Fair: A Dramatic Pastoral with other Poems, Songs, and Prose Sketches (Glasgow n.d.).

Oscar Wilde: The Letters of ... ed. Rupert Hart-Davis (London 1962).

W. B. Yeats: The Celtic Twilight (London 1893).

Young Scots Society: Manifesto and Appeal to the Scottish on Scottish Home Rule (Edinburgh 1911).

2. SECONDARY SOURCES

Flavia Alaya: William Sharp-"Fiona Macleod": 1855-1905 (Cambridge Massachussetts 1970).

Bernard Alderson: Arthur James Balfour: The Man and his Work (London 1903).

Richard Aldington: Portrait of a Rebel: The Life and Work of Robert Louis Stevenson (London 1957).

C. A. Archer: William Archer: Life, Work and Friendships (London 1931).

Eric Ashby and Mary Anderson: Portrait of Haldane at Work on Education (London 1974).

Graham Balfour: The Life of Robert Louis Stevenson (2 vols. London 1901).

J. C. Beckett: The Making of Modern Ireland: 1603-1923 (London 1966).

S. H. Bell et al: The Arts in Ulster (London 1951).

Tom Bell: John Maclean: A Fighter for Freedom (Glasgow 1944).

George Blake: Barrie and the Kailyard School (London 1951).

Robert Blake: The Unknown Prime Minister: The Life and Times of Andrew Bonar Law 1858-1923 (London 1955).

Philip Boardman: Patrick Geddes: Maker of the Future (London 1944).

Henry Boylan: A Dictionary of Irish Biography (Dublin 1978).

Piers Brendon: Eminent Edwardians (London 1979).

George E. Brown: A Book of R.L.S. (London 1919).

Alice Buchan: A Scrap Screen (London 1979).

William Buchan: John Buchan: A Memoir (London 1982).

J. H. Buckley: William Ernest Henley: A Study in the Counter-Decadence of the Nineties (Princeton 1945).

K. D. Buckley: Trade Unionism in Aberdeen: 1878-1900 (Edinburgh 1955).

Osbert Burdett: The Beardsley Period: An Essay in Perspective (London 1925).

David Butler and Jennie Freeman: British Political Facts: 1900-1960 (London 1963).

Jenni Calder: RLS: A Life Study (London 1980).

ed. Jenni Calder: The Robert Louis Stevenson Companion (Edinburgh 1980).

Alan B. Campbell: The Lanarkshire Miners: A Social History of their Trade Unions 1775-1874 (Edinburgh 1979).

John Dickson Carr: The Life of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle (London 1949).

Thomas F. G. Coates: Lord Rosebery: His Life and Speeches (2 vols. London 1900).

Maurice Colles: The History of Ulster: From the Earliest Times to the Present Day (4 vols. London 1919-20).

John Connell: W. E. Henley (London 1949).

L. Cope Cornford: W. E. Henley (London 1913).

Sir Reginald Coupland: Welsh and Scottish Nationalism: A Study (London 1954).

The Marquess of Crewe, K.G.: Lord Rosebery (2 vols. London 1931).

L. P. Curtis Jnr.: Anglo-Saxons and Celts: A Study of anti-Irish Prejudice in Victorian England (Bridgeport Conn. 1968).

David Daiches: Robert Louis Stevenson (Glasgow 1947).

George Dangerfield: The Strange Death of Liberal England: 1910-1914 (London 1936).

David Daniell: The Interpreter's House: A Critical Assessment of John Buchan (London 1975).

Dictionary of National Biography (35 vols. London 1885-1901 and supplements).

Margaret Digby: Horace Plunkett: An Anglo-American Irishman (Oxford 1949).

Blanche E. C. Dugdale: Arthur James Balfour: First Earl of Balfour, K.G., O.M., F.R.S., Etc. (2 vols. London 1936).

Owen Dudley Edwards: "The Catholic Press in Scotland Since the Restoration of the Hierarchy": Innes Review vol. XXIX, 2.

The Quest for Sherlock Holmes: A Biographical Study of Arthur Conan Doyle (Edinburgh 1983).

A. R. D. Elliot: The Life of George Joachim Goschen: First Viscount Goschen 1831-1907 (2 vols. London 1911).

R. C. K. Ensor: England: 1870-1914 (Oxford 1936).

William Ferguson: Scotland: 1689 to the Present (Edinburgh 1968).

Sir James Fergusson: The Curragh Incident (London 1964).

H. A. L. Fisher: James Bryce: Viscount Bryce of Dechmont, O.M. (2 vols. London 1927).

R. F. Foster: Lord Randolph Churchill: A Political Life (Oxford 1981).

J. C. Furnas: Voyage to Windward: The Life of Robert Louis Stevenson (London 1952).

Hamilton Fyfe: T. P. O'Connor (London 1934).

Peter Green: Kenneth Grahame: 1859-1932: A Study of his Life, Work and Times (London 1959).

Roger Lancelyn Green: Andrew Lang: A Critical Biography (Leicester 1946).

ed. Roger Lancelyn Green: Kipling: The Critical Heritage (London 1971).

Denis Gwynn: The Life of John Redmond (London 1932).

D. A. Hamer: Liberal Politics in the Age of Gladstone and Rosebery: A Study in Leadership and Policy (Oxford 1972).

J. A. Hammerton: Lord Rosebery: Imperialist (London 1901).

J. E. Handley: The Irish in Modern Scotland (Cork 1947).

The Irish in Scotland (Cork 1943).

The Navvy in Scotland (Cork n.d.).

H. J. Hanham: "The Creation of the Scottish Office, 1881-87": Juridical Review 1965.

H. J. Hanham: Scottish Nationalism (London 1969).

Frank Harris: Bernard Shaw: An Unauthorised Biography Based on Firsthand Information (London 1931).

Francis Russell Hart: The Scottish Novel: A Critical Survey (London 1978).

Christopher Harvie: Scotland and Nationalism: Scottish Society and Politics 1707-1977 (London 1977).

G. A. Hayes-McCoy: "Robert Louis Stevenson and the Irish Question": Studies vol. XXXIX 1950.

Richard E. Haymaker: Prince-Errant and Evocator of Horizons (Kingsport Tenn. 1967).

Michael Hechter: Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966 (London 1975).

R. F. V. Heuston: Lives of the Lord Chancellors: 1885-1940 (Oxford 1964).

T. W. Heyck: The Dimensions of British Radicalism: The Case of Ireland 1874-1895 (London 1974).

C. W. Hill: Edwardian Scotland (Edinburgh 1976).

Joseph Hone: W. B. Yeats: 1865-1939 (London 1942).

Konrad Hopkins and Ronald Van Roekel: William Sharp/Fiona Macleod: (1855-1905) (Renfrew 1977).

Emrys Hughes: Keir Hardie (London 1956).

James Hunter: The Making of the Crofting Community (Edinburgh 1976).

Brian Inglis: Roger Casement (London 1973).

Holbrook Jackson: The Eighteen Nineties: A Review of Art and Ideas at the Close of the Nineteenth Century (reprint London 1931).

Robert Rhodes James: Rosebery: A Biography of Archibald Philip, Fifth Earl of Rosebery (London 1963).

Roy Jenkins: Asquith (London 1964).

S. H. Jeyes: The Earl of Rosebery (London 1906).

The Life and Times of the Right Honourable the Marquis of Salisbury, K.G.: A History of the Conservative Party during the last Fifty Years (4 vols. London n.d.).

Joseph Johnson: George Macdonald (London 1906).

M. Keating and D. Bleiman: Labour and Scottish Nationalism (London 1979).

James G. Kellas: "The Mid-Lanark By-Election (1888) and the Scottish Labour Party (1888-1894)": Parliamentary Affairs vol. 18, 1965.

Modern Scotland: The Nation Since 1870 (London 1968).

J. E. Kendle: "The Round Table Movement and Home Rule All Round": Historical Journal XI 1968.

Paddy Kitchen: A Most Unsettling Person: An Introduction to the Ideas and Life of Patrick Geddes (London 1975).

ed. William Knox: Scottish Labour Leaders: 1918-1939: A Biographical Dictionary (Edinburgh 1984).

Stephen Koss: Asquith (London 1976).

Lord Haldane: Scapegoat for Liberalism (London 1969).

Joseph Lee: The Modernisation of Irish Society: 1848-1918 (Dublin 1973).

Samuel Levenson: James Connolly: A Biography (London 1973).

Elizabeth Longford: A Pilgrimage of Passion: The Life of Wilfrid Scawen Blunt (paperback edition London 1982).

F. S. L. Lyons: Charles Stewart Parnell (paperback edition London 1978).

"The Economic Ideas of Parnell": Historical Studies III 1959.

Ireland Since the Famine (revised edition London 1973).

J. F. McCaffrey: "The Irish Vote in Glasgow in the Later Nineteenth Century": Innes Review vol. XXI, Spring 1970, pp. 30-6.

Hugh MacDiarmid: Cunninghame Graham: A Centenary Study (Glasgow 1952).

Scottish Eccentrics (London 1936).

Denis Mackail: The Story of J.M.B.: A Biography (London 1941).

Iain McLean: Keir Hardie (London 1965).

Philip Magnus: Gladstone: A Biography (London 1954).

Magnus Magnusson et al: The Glorious Privilege: The History of "The Scotsman" (London 1967).

Alexander Maitland: Robert and Gabriella Cunninghame Graham (Edinburgh 1983).

Sir Ian Malcolm: Lord Balfour: A Memory (London 1930).

Edward Marjoribanks: The Life of Lord Carson (vol. 1 London 1932): continued by: Ian Colvin: The Life of Lord Carson (vol. 2 London 1934).

Anne Marreco: The Rebel Countess: The Life and Times of Constance Markievicz (Philadelphia 1967).

H. C. G. Matthew: The Liberal Imperialists: The Ideas and Politics of a Post-Gladstonian Elite (Oxford 1973).

John Mercer: Scotland: The Devolution of Power (London 1978).

David W. Miller: Church, State and Nation in Ireland: 1898-1921 (Dublin 1973).

T. W. Moody: "The Irish University Question of the Nineteenth Century": History vol. XLIII, 148, June 1958.

"Michael Davitt and the British Labour Movement 1882-1906": Transactions of the Royal Historical Society 5th ser. 3 1953.

"The Times versus Parnell and Co., 1887-90": Historical Studies VI 1968.

K. O. Morgan: Keir Hardie (London 1967).

Wales in British Politics: 1868-1922 (Cardiff 1963).

John Morley: The Life of William Ewart Gladstone (2 vols. edition London 1905).

ed. A. J. A. Morris: Edwardian Radicalism: 1900-1914 Some Aspects of British Radicalism (London 1974).

David B. Morris: Robert Louis Stevenson and the Scottish Highlanders (London 1929).

Hon. Arthur C. Murray: Master and Brother: Murrays of Elibank (London 1945).

Tom Nairn: The Break-Up of Britain: Crisis and Neo-Nationalism (London 1977).

Wallace Notestein: The Scot in History (London 1946).

Richard Barry O'Brien: The Life of Charles Stewart Parnell: 1846-1891 (1 vol. edition London 1910).

Leon O'Broin: The Prime Informer: A Suppressed Scandal (British edition London 1971).

T. P. O'Connor: Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman (London 1908).

Alan O'Day: The English Face of Irish Nationalism: Parnellite Involvement in British Politics 1880-86 (Dublin 1977).

H. J. Paton: The Claim of Scotland (London 1968).

Hesketh Pearson: Conan Doyle: His Life and Art (London 1943).

H. M. Pelling: The Origins of the Labour Party: 1880-1900 (2nd. edition Oxford 1965).

Arthur Ponsonby: Henry Ponsonby: Queen Victoria's Private Secretary, His Life from His Letters (London 1942).

James Pope-Hennessy: Robert Louis Stevenson (London 1974).

Sir Robert Rait and George S. Pryde: Scotland (2nd. edition revised by Pryde London 1954).

E. T. Raymond: The Man of Promise: Lord Rosebery A Critical Study (London 1923).

Mr. Balfour: A Biography (London 1920).

Portraits of the Nineties (London 1921).

Stewart Alan Robertson: A Moray Loon (London 1933).

Peter Rowland: The Last Liberal Governments:

vol. 1: The Promised Land 1905-1910 (London 1968).

vol. 2: Unfinished Business 1911-1914 (London 1972).

Trevor Royle: The Macmillan Companion to Scottish Literature (London 1983).

Elizabeth A. Sharp: William Sharp: A Memoir (London 1910).

Anthony Slaven: The Development of the West of Scotland: 1750-1960 (London 1975).

Janet Adam Smith: John Buchan: A Biography (London 1965).

John Buchan and His World (London 1979).

Dudley Sommer: Haldane of Cloan: His Life and Times 1856-1928 (London 1960).

J. A. Spender: The Life of the Right Hon. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman G.C.B. (2 vols. London 1923).

J. A. Spender and Cyril Asquith: Life of Herbert Henry Asquith: Lord Oxford and Asquith (2 vols. London 1932).

Thomas J. Spinner Jr.: George Joachim Goschen: The Transformation of a Victorian Liberal (Cambridge 1973).

Peter Stansky: Ambitions and Strategies: The Struggle for the Leadership of the Liberal Party in the 1890s (Oxford 1964).

A. T. Q. Stewart: The Ulster Crisis (London 1967).

William Stewart: J. Keir Hardie: A Biography (London 1921).

Anna M. Stoddart: John Stuart Blackie: A Biography (2 vols. Edinburgh 1895).

Jane T. Stoddart: The Earl of Rosebery: An Illustrated Biography (London 1900).

William Robertson Nicoll: Editor and Preacher (London 1903).

James Thorpe: English Illustration: The Nineties (London 1935).

A. F. Tschiffely: Don Roberto: Being the Account of the Life and Works of R. B. Cunninghame Graham 1852-1936 (London 1937).

A. C. Turner: Mr. Buchan: Writer (London 1949).

Richard Usborne: Clubland Heroes: A Nostalgic Study of some Recurrent Characters in the Romantic Fiction of Dornford Yates, John Buchan and Sapper (London 1953).

James Veitch: George Douglas Brown (London 1952).

ed. J. Vincent and M. Stenton: McCalmont's Parliamentary Poll Book: British Election Results 1832-1918 (8th. edition Brighton 1971).

H. M. Walbrook: J. M. Barrie and the Theatre (London 1922).

Cedric Watts and Laurence Davies: Cunninghame Graham: A Critical Biography (Cambridge 1979).

Keith Webb: The Growth of Nationalism in Scotland (revised edition London 1978).

Stanley Weintraub: Beardsley (paperback edition London 1972).

H. F. West: Don Roberto (London 1936).

A Modern Conquistador: Robert Bontine Cunninghame Graham: His Life and Works (London 1932).

John Wilson: CB: A Life of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman (New York 1973).

ed. J. N. Wolfe: Government and Nationalism in Scotland: An Enquiry by Members of the University of Edinburgh (Edinburgh 1969).

Ian Wood: "Irish Immigrants and Scottish Radicalism 1880-1906" in: ed. Ian MacDougall: Essays in Scottish Labour History: A Tribute to W. H. Marwick (Edinburgh n.d.).

Kenneth Young: Arthur James Balfour: The Happy Life of the Politician, Prime Minister, Statesman and Philosopher (London 1963).

S. H. Zebel: Balfour: A Political Biography (Cambridge 1973).